

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

P
Univ.
H.

1

19982

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

ISSUED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

THE FACULTY

OF

Hartford Theological Seminary

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

VOLUME XIX

1909

Hartford Seminary Press
HARTFORD, CONN.

1909

106198
11/11/10

CONTENTS OF VOL. XIX, 1909.

	PAGE
Editorials	I, 81, 159, 303

Contributed Articles

A Pulpit Personality — Lyman Beecher,	<i>F. L. Holmes</i>	113
Abraham Lincoln — An Interpretation,	<i>E. R. Allen</i>	103
The Bible,	<i>Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick, D. D.</i>	238
The Call of God in Relation to Personal Experience,	<i>Wm. Thomson</i>	127
The Challenge of Our Times,	<i>Pres. H. C. King, LL. D.</i>	234
The Christian Principle of Moral Suffering in Social Redemption,	<i>H. A. Walter</i>	87
The Church and Religious Education,	<i>Pres. W. H. P. Faunce, LL. D.</i>	269
The Curriculum of a Theological Seminary,	<i>Dean Shailer Mathews, D. D.</i>	248
The Doctrine of Salvation,	<i>Rev. S. G. Barnes, D. D.</i>	38
The Essential Message,	<i>Pres. O. S. Davis, D. D.</i>	244
The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,	<i>Rev. R. H. Potter, D. D.</i>	25
The Field of Religious Education,	<i>Rev. H. F. Cope</i>	262
Hartford Alumni in Foreign Missions,	<i>Rev. J. L. Barton, D. D.</i>	192
Hartford Alumni in Home Missions,	<i>Rev. H. H. Kelsey</i>	199
Hartford Seminary in Teaching,	<i>Prof. Williston Walker, D. D.</i>	206
Hartford Seminary in Literature,	<i>Prof. E. C. Richardson, Ph. D.</i>	211
Hartford Alumni in the Pulpit,	<i>Rev. N. Van der Pyl</i>	218
Ministerial Leadership,	<i>Prof. C. S. Nash, D. D.</i>	5
The Present Task of the Ministry,	<i>Pres. Woodrow Wilson, LL. D.</i>	226
The Seminary and Religious Movements,	<i>Rev. R. F. Horton, D. D.</i>	278
The Seminary and the City,	<i>Rev. R. H. Potter, D. D.</i>	280
The Seminary and the Nation,	<i>Rev. H. Herring, D. D.</i>	282
The Seminary and the World,	<i>Hon. S. B. Capen, LL. D.</i>	288
Some Things to Emphasize in Preaching,	<i>Rev. G. L. Clark</i>	31
The Training of the Teacher,	<i>Rev. G. McElfresh</i>	273

In the Book-World

<i>Adam:</i> Religious Teachers of Greece,	147
<i>Aked:</i> Old Events and Modern Meanings,	55
<i>Avebury:</i> Peace and Happiness,	150
<i>Barnes:</i> Voices of Faith and Love,	151
<i>Barton:</i> Daybreak in Turkey,	144
<i>Black:</i> The Gift of Influence,	53
<i>Boy's Eye View</i> of the Sunday-school,	151
<i>Broughton:</i> Salvation and the Old Theology,	48
<i>Brown:</i> The Gospel of Good Health,	57
<i>Burrell:</i> The Lure of the City,	55
<i>Carus:</i> God,	49
<i>Clark:</i> The Christian Method of Ethics,	51
<i>Devine:</i> Misery and its Causes,	320
<i>Dole:</i> What we Know about Jesus,	49
<i>Farrar:</i> A Junior Congregation,	56
<i>Fairweather:</i> The Background of the Gospels,	312
<i>Faunce:</i> The Educational Ideal of the Ministry,	51
<i>Foley:</i> Anselm's Theory of the Atonement,	142
<i>Gilbert:</i> The Acts of the Apostles,	313
<i>Gilbert:</i> Interpretation of the Bible,	46
<i>Girdlestone:</i> Old Testament Theology,	315
<i>Gordon:</i> Quiet Talks with World Winners,	149
<i>Goodspeed:</i> Hebrews,	48
<i>Graham:</i> The Grammar of Philosophy,	50
<i>Hastings:</i> Dictionary of the Bible,	131
<i>Heron:</i> History of Puritanism,	143
<i>Herridge:</i> The Coign of Vantage,	56
<i>Hirschky:</i> Artaxerxes III,	310
<i>Holbrook:</i> The Panorama of Creation,	311
<i>Holden:</i> Redeeming Vision,	148

	PAGE
How to Talk with God,	148
<i>Hoyt</i> : The Preacher,	149
<i>Hyde</i> : Abba, Father,	56
<i>Ibn Miskawayh</i> : Universal History,	316
Index to Periodical Articles on Religion,	307
<i>Jackson</i> : The Fact of Conversion,	146
<i>Jacobus</i> : Standard Bible Dictionary,	131
<i>Jevons</i> : Introduction to the Study of Religion,	146
<i>Jones, J. P.</i> : India, its Life and Thought,	317
<i>Jones, R. M.</i> : Studies in Mystical Religion,	316
<i>Jordan</i> : Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought,	309
<i>King</i> : The Laws of Friendship, Human and Divine,	317
<i>MacDonald</i> : Mind, Religion and Health,	145
<i>McLear</i> : A Comfortable Faith,	52
<i>Margoliouth</i> : Yaqut's Dictionary of Scholars,	315
<i>Marti</i> : Religion of the Old Testament,	47
<i>Matheson</i> : Messages of Hope,	146
<i>Mead</i> : The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ,	314
One Volume Bible Commentary,	308
<i>Otto</i> : Life and Ministry of Jesus,	48
<i>Park</i> : The Keen Joy of Living,	57
<i>Paton</i> : Commentary on Esther,	139
<i>Pearson</i> : Literary and Biographical Essays, Threelfold Cord, Search after Truth,	49
<i>Peck</i> : Paralipomena,	48
<i>Raymond</i> : Psychology of Inspiration,	57
<i>Redhouse</i> : al Khazraji's History, and Annotations,	315
<i>Riggenbach</i> : Resurrection of Jesus,	49
<i>Robertson</i> : Epochs in the Life of St. Paul,	314
<i>Rumbell</i> : Jesus and Modern Religion,	49
<i>Rutherford</i> : St. Paul's Epistles to Colossae and Laodicea,	313
<i>Sabatier</i> : Modernism,	143
<i>Schaff-Herzog</i> : Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,	37
<i>Schechter</i> : Rabbinic Theology,	141
<i>Schenck</i> : Biblical Sociology,	319
<i>Spargo</i> : Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism,	143
<i>Stelze</i> : Successful Advertising,	149
<i>Stimson</i> : The New Things of God,	54
<i>Thomas</i> : The Joy of Bible Study,	319
<i>Walker</i> : Great Men of the Christian Church,	142
<i>Westfall</i> : A Common-sense View of Mind Cure,	145
<i>Wenner</i> : Religious Education and the Public School,	50
What Shall I Believe?	50

Among the Alumni

Alumni Register	63
Miscellaneous Items	63, 153, 324
Necrology	322

Happenings in the Seminary

Anniversary Dinner	295
Anniversary Program	163
Graduation Exercises of Hartford Seminary	223
Graduation Exercises of the School for Religious Pedagogy	234
The Seventy-fifth Anniversary	328
Miscellaneous Items	60, 153, 332

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

VOL. XIX, NO. 1—JANUARY, 1909.

[Entered at the Hartford Post Office as Second Class Matter.]

Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 30 cents. Remit to Order of HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS, Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Conn.

EDITORIAL BOARD :—Professor Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor Waldo Selden Pratt. Professor Austin Bradley Bassett. *Business Manager* :—Eugene Barnard Smith.

Professor Nash's article on " Ministerial Leadership " is the second of the course of Carew Lectures on " The Congregational Polity To-day." It is expected that later the whole course will be published in book form, and readers of Professor Nash's handling of this theme will doubtless look forward with anticipation to the appearance of the complete volume. Professor Nash has come to have a position on the Pacific Coast of really commanding influence in the shaping of the polity of the new Congregationalism of the West. As a member of the Committee of the National Council on Church Polity he was among the foremost of those who drew the report to the last Council, which bids fair to mark an epoch in the history of the denomination. The paper here presented deals with the phases of the new movement which touch most closely the life of the individual minister and of the institutions in which he is trained. It touches the spiritual life of the pastor, as well as the organized effort of the church, at its very center.

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is the expression of the general consciousness in all denominations of an ideal of which the movement toward the unification of Congregationalism, and its efforts to unite with other denominations, is one step. We are glad to give impressions of this most significant gathering from the pen of the pastor of the Center Church, Hartford. The papers of Dr. Barnes and of Mr. Clark are significant as pointing to a renewed evaluation

on the part of doctrinal theology and practical preaching of the central place for the whole Christian life of the word "Saviour" as expressive of the deepest meaning of the life and personality of Jesus Christ.

At the next Annual Commencement Hartford Seminary is to celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of its founding. For this event careful preparations are being made to render the occasion a worthy one. As a first small contribution to this end the RECORD publishes an Address List of living alumni so far as known. The attention of Alumni is called to this, and they are requested to fill gaps and make corrections so far as possible. It is a difficult matter to keep such a list correct and up to date, especially in view of the present tendency toward short pastorates.

One of the frequent complaints respecting so-called conservative views in theology is that they are not interesting. We know the positions already, and it is the new that attracts. Professor James is probably not far from right when, in his "Pragmatism," he declares that in the sphere of Philosophy of Religion men want something radical, and he squeezes the upholders of a theistic position closely between two antithetic radical views, and then tries to construct a system which shall have the charm of novelty without identifying itself with the radicalness of either of these positions. Whatever else Mr. Chesterton has done in his book entitled "Orthodoxy" he has succeeded in making orthodoxy interesting by means of his brilliant, and one must confess at times surfeiting, paradoxes. He has contrived to impart to the upholding of orthodox conceptions a most stimulating quality of real excitement.

There is in this a suggestion for thoughtful consideration. The words "eclectic," "compromising," "mediating," "apologetic" are not popular adjectives to hear applied to one. A free rein, a straight course, a logical principle, a guiding star by means of which one arrives in glowing triumph at the goal—these are the things that attract. And yet is there not more excitement in watching Odysseus slip by between Scylla and Charybdis than there would be in seeing him rush head on into the whirlpool,

or crash upon the rocks? There is mighty little plain straight sailing over the sea of life and still less in the flood of theological thought.

By way of illustration take the rich modern doctrine of the immanence of God and examine a little where it comes out when handled in accordance with the theory of the straight line.

The most common antithesis set up by way of its elucidation is that between the "immanent God" and the "absentee God." Our theological forbears, it is intimated, thought of God as removed from his universe. We have attained to the great truth that he is not remote from his world, but "closer than breathing," etc. Now, it is perhaps not unfitting in passing to remark that such a contrast seems to imply that in the past there never was any such doctrine as that of the omnipresence of God, and that our ancestors in theology did not believe in either special providences, or in the direct answer to prayer. But we are not concerned with the historical infelicities so much as with the logical outcome of the "radical" treatment of the doctrine of the immanent God, when compared with the similar treatment of the "absentee God."

Fundamental to the developed conception of the "absentee God" was the idea of God's absolute and changeless perfection. This perfect being, if he was to make a world, must necessarily have made it perfect, if he created man he must have made him perfect, if he gave a revelation he must have made that originally perfect, else he must deny his own perfection. Now God did all these things. What then is there left for him to do? He has made manifest himself and his perfection in his universe. Man has only to study God's product and he will know God. The outcome is, of course, that knowledge of God is confined to knowledge of his universe. He may exist apart from it; but from the human point of view he is limited to it. Anyone familiar with eighteenth century literature will recognize the historic accuracy of the logical analysis.

The radical exponents of the doctrine of the "Immanent God" begin with reacting from this idea of a God remote from his universe, and declare that the upshot is a logical atheism. Nothing is left for man to know but the universe itself. But

God is really not apart from the universe, he is in the universe. The laws of the universe are not put into it by God, but they are the very laws of his own being, he is manifesting himself, he is realizing himself, in the universe. Since this is so the laws of the universe are the constant expression of his very being. When we discern one of them, like the evolutionary law of progress from the lower to the higher, we know that it is the necessary expression of God's eternal nature. He must be ever expressing himself in this one way. The way to learn of God is to study him at work. We can see him at work in his universe, we can never know of his operation elsewhere. To repeat the phrase of the contrasted theory of God, "He may exist apart from it, but from the human point of view he is limited to it." The outcome of the "radical" treatment of both notions is the same. God can be known only from his universe, there can be no knowledge of the supernatural. The conception of God in both cases is the same, God limited to and known through his universe. The only difference, wide as that difference may be, is in the knowledge of the universe. God as knowable, or approachable, apart from his universe is just as "absentee" in one case as the other.

How beautifully this agrees with the modern definition of a straight line as the arc of an infinite circle.

MINISTERIAL LEADERSHIP.

In our Congregational theory the Church is, first of all, composed of ordinary men and women who love our Lord Jesus Christ and unite for service in His name. This theory, as held in completeness and consistency by us, distinguishes our polity. Out of the Church comes the specialized ministry of religion. Needing instructors and leaders, the Church lays hands on a sufficient number and puts them forth. They in turn are evermore responsible to the Church and depend upon her for opportunity and resources. The Church is first, the ministry second and subordinate.

In practical administration, however, the ministry leads. Scarcely an individual church anywhere is organized apart from its agency. The machinery of the Kingdom is in its hands even to an unfortunate degree. This leadership of a class of men is inevitable and not to be deplored. No more than the State, can the Church prosper save by competent and devoted leaders. The primacy of leadership among practical problems of administration needs emphasis, but not argument. Mr. John R. Mott, in his latest volume — "The Future Leadership of the Church," — is saying, "Wherever the Church has proved inadequate, it has been due to inadequate leadership. . . . The failure to raise up a competent ministry would be a far greater failure than not to win converts to the faith, because the enlargement of the Kingdom ever waits for leaders of power. . . . To secure able men for the Christian ministry is an object of transcendent, weighty, and world-wide concern. It involves the life, the growth, the extension of the Church, — the future of Christianity itself."

At the present moment we Congregationalists — and others

with us — are convicted of remissness and consequent weakness on this principal point. Our problem of leadership is affecting to an alarming degree our whole enterprise. It has been for some years a low time with regard to our ministry. Full ranks of young men have not been coming. Too few of the best equipped men have come. We are painfully aware of a low conception of the ministry among college students. The phases and causes of this situation have been much in print, and are freshly given in Mr. Mott's volume. There are this year encouraging signs that the tide will make in again, but it is too soon to predict this with assurance.

Primary responsibility for its leadership rests upon the Church. It may not be discharged upon the ministry, nor upon the young men in the colleges, nor even upon the Christian home. This mighty institution named the Church, whose existence, prosperity and usefulness absolutely depend — under God — upon its leadership, should take organized and sufficient measures to insure that leadership. Its best agency for this is the Christian home. At this time the Church and the home are not furnishing the conditions and motives which, when present, will always carry a sufficient number of their sons into the ministry. That vocation is now discredited in the minds of great numbers of Christian parents and church members, and hence inevitably in the minds of the boys and young men. Mr. Mott's unequalled observation leads him to testify that increasing numbers of Christian parents and church members in the evangelical churches generally do not care to have their sons enter the ministry, are not thinking them prayerfully on in that direction, but are actively turning them toward other vocations. This atmosphere cannot be kept negative, leaving young men unaffected to reach an unbiased decision. Indeed, there is little scruple about making it affirmative and influential. Until it is corrected the best hope tarries. Until the ministry is restored to its sacred place in the regard of church members and parents, no formal measures can contend successfully for recruits. Nor is there any correction of this state of things save by what the psychologists are calling re-education. The mind of the Church and the home, now working too habit-

ually away from the ministry, must be restored to a habit favorable thereto. It is a case for mental and spiritual healing,—disclaiming the technical meaning of the phrase.

But now, having laid this obligation where it fundamentally belongs, upon the Church as an institution, upon Christians and church members in general, upon parents and teachers and church officers in particular, I feel like throwing it specifically upon the ministry itself. When you are not theorizing, but urging practical measures, you have to say that in every department of human activity results depend upon the leaders of action. Theirs is the prime responsibility for the long working of cause and effect. The ministry of the Church is definitely responsible for its own numbers and quality. The re-education of the Church and the home on this subject is their task. And prior to that they have to rectify their own state of mind. For at the present time the ministry is not warmly accrediting and sustaining its own craft, is not exalting its own vocation, is not crying with an exultant challenge to the young men, including its own sons. Here as elsewhere statements must be careful, and the appeal is to your general observation. On that basis, and on suggestive evidence appearing from time by time in our religious journals, are we not within bounds in saying that there is in the minds and homes of ministers themselves widespread reluctance to have their own sons follow them? Mr. Mott says: "Even ministers and their wives, in an increasing number of cases, are not encouraging their sons to consider this calling. Far too frequently they positively discourage such serious consideration." If this is true, there is much to be said in palliation and even justification of special cases; there is also much to be said to the Church about suffering such a state of things, such treatment of its leaders, as would justify any number of them in reaching this state of mind. But my contention at this moment is this, that such a minister, or such a group of ministers, is both unfit and unwilling to lead other men's sons into the ministry, unfit and unwilling to re-educate the Church and the home on the subject. The case must remain lean and unhelpful so long and so far as the ministers of Christ remain heavy laden and dispirited with their task, so far as they judge it by its

incidentals, so far as its great visions fail them, so far as they cannot lay upon their own sons first and then on others a hand of joy unspeakable and full of glory.

And now—for we are in the domain of administration—it is urged that we Congregationalists should take constructive measures for sustaining our ministerial leadership at its highest point of efficiency. We certainly have no adequate measures at present. Far too little is being done, and most of that is volunteer effort, partial and unrelated. The Congregational denomination as such, with a national life and world-wide service, is conducting no apparatus for assuring its own permanent power through adequate leadership. It is wonderful that we fare on as well as we do. But are we not arriving at that administrative consciousness which would take earnest measures to restore conditions and develop provisions? It is time that the Congregational Church undertook its ministerial leadership in large-minded, far-reaching and patient plans.

What, then, have we to do that may be said to require so much? We have, in brief phrase, to re-educate our churches, to rectify conditions, and then to go out after the best young men in our colleges and homes.

I. First in the order of a minister's career stands his theological training, to which we may give an earnest moment in passing. Our schools of theology possess the confidence of churches and ministry to a high degree. There is, of course, distressed and militant criticism; there are also better grades of the same fabric, not less firm, but inwrought with courtesy, faith and cheer. There are improvements and enrichments always due in theological training. It is desirable that these be pressed upon the seminaries, for vested interests incline to slow down into security and comfort. But criticism and impulse are in no danger of failing from the ecclesiastical earth.

What, then, should our churches, as organized into a branch of the Church of Christ, do for and with the seminaries? The question of denominational control, perhaps, comes first to mind. There is excellent historical counsel on this subject. It is vital to both churches and seminaries to enjoy unreserved intimacy

together. The mutual benefits are too obvious for rehearsal. The seminaries draw their life from the Church and the Kingdom, and exist solely to serve these. Administrative control by the organized churches is logical and practical, even in Congregationalism; its absence looks strange to many eyes, but this also is very Congregational. For myself, I neither fear it nor advocate it. Local autonomy here does not imperil great interests, while it makes for that priceless thing, the freedom of the truth. Advance has ever come and must ever come through the fearless pioneering of men who grow used to the wide horizon. But short of control the association of churches and ministers with the theological schools should be perfect, promoted on both sides with perseverance and love. Each should offer the other all possible service. Each should be sure of the other's readiness. The active exchange should be continuous and whole-hearted.

Given intimate association and sturdy criticism, there is but one further requisite for assuring continuous improvement and adaptation in our ministerial training. That one essential is ample resources. The same old cry, to be sure, simply because there is no other cry and no adequate response to this one. The required advances in training none see more sanely or desire more ardently than our seminary faculties, and trustee boards. Give them power to do always the better thing, and they will do it; any timorous or indolent reluctance is easily overcome.

Down to almost the present hour in Congregational administration financial action has been entirely local, individual and voluntary. A better day has dawned. Witness our scheme of proportionate benevolence, here at last and here to stay. We are reducing to system the use of money in the service of God; the day of sentimental disorder is declining. Into this process our theological institutions should be admitted. Denominational commendation of the seminaries as conspicuous parts of our machinery requiring provision adequate to extreme efficiency would sound an urgent note in the ears of our generous givers. Enormous gifts go annually into education. No proper proportion of these is for theological education. If one or two of our seminaries are amply endowed through private generosity,

the rest are straitened and strained well-nigh to the breaking point. Our churches want the finest young men out of the best equipped colleges of the land. They cannot have them unless they enable their professional schools to equal in their own department, the amplitude, the freedom, the pedagogical quality to which the young men have become accustomed in the colleges. The lack at present is not in the methods in vogue in our theological halls, nor in the men who labor there; it is in the financial inability of these alert and eager men to develop the methods.

II. Considering conditions in the ministry which need attention and repair, the first is that of the minister's salary. This is doubtless to be regarded as the lowest thing of all, but it cannot be belittled out of sight. It is always painfully in evidence. Recently the Rev. Jonathan Hardup and his friends have been expressing breezy and not at all sordid opinions in our religious papers. Our National Council at its Cleveland meeting passed an earnest resolution that better financial support of the ministry be urged upon the churches. Several important articles during recent years in our magazine literature have discussed this factor in the situation, none so frankly and justly as Mr. Mott's volume, to which frequent reference is being made in this lecture. The cost of education for the ministry and the cost of living as ministers must live are greater than ever. The special demands upon his purse are not only greater than formerly but greater in proportion to his income than upon any other person in the community. Yet his salary has not risen proportionately; in many communities it has declined. "Thousands of ministers receive stipends which amount to less than the wages of day laborers." Nor is the meagre salary always paid promptly, while some of it is never paid. This is one of the standing reasons why young men do not enter the ministry. It acts upon the young men themselves, and it acts still more forcibly upon their parents. But it were well if the churches could understand *how* it acts. It is no matter of shrewd commercial calculation. In this question are involved high interests and sacred values, such as a minister's financial integrity and

standing in the community, his personal growth by means of books and meetings and travel, his mental ease and freedom for the high levels whereon lies the significance of religious work, his ability to create and sustain a home, the education of his children, his problems of sickness and old age. All these and other things belong inherently to manhood; they are human, not professional. And being human, they are not to be displaced nor rendered inoperative by impossible professional conditions.

Now the rub comes at the point of discovery that these financial conditions of the ministry are unnecessary and morally wrong. Neither the consecrated young man nor his parents are afraid of poverty. Ministers who are worth while do not abandon the ministry through the love of money. Necessary and fruitful sacrifice commands as much heroism as ever. But the current financial conditions of the ministry are not necessary, and submission to them is ceasing to be heroic. "Men," says Mr. Mott, "are not less heroic than of old; but they have knowledge and discernment, and they see that it is not poverty, but carelessness and selfishness that dictate the financial provision for many ministers today." This means that the pastor's work may lie among men and women who will discredit him in advance for accepting an unworthy and ineffective situation, who will be by so much less accessible to the high impulses which he brings, who will, worst of all, be so far forth themselves unfit to constitute a sacrificial force for Christ and righteousness. Less wonder—in this view of the facts—that the young man shuns the unnecessary sacrifice, and that his parents—living in a parsonage perhaps—are sadly silent as he turns away.

The aim of this moment is less to describe this situation than to urge denominational action to correct what has grown to be a great wrong. In the unequal local conditions of our churches the difficulty cannot be conquered separately. Co-operative effort is required upon a denominational and even an interdenominational scale. For it would be inadequate, even if helpful, to repair insufficient salaries out of a national Congregational treasury. The trouble is enormously augmented by sectarianism and the financial waste in overchurched communi-

ties. We must agree with Mr. Mott's conclusion, when he says: "Nothing is clearer than that the different Christian communions should deal thoroughly with the problem of insuring adequate salaries for their ministers, and that the various Christian bodies unitedly should agree on a policy which would do away with the unnecessary multiplication and unwise distribution of churches."

III. Close to this matter of adequate salaries lies that of putting within the reach of our ministers the means of sustaining their mental and spiritual power. Increased salaries, even if they came at once wherever needed, would not obviate this further requirement. The draught upon the pastor's thought and vitality is incessant and uncalculating. His sustained intellectual production is equaled by no other man in the community. His sympathies may never cease to flow, for human need holds the spigot open night and day. It is Dr. Oliver W. Holmes who says, better lose a pint of blood than have a nerve tapped. Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, in a lecture from this platform, presented in thrilling words "the doom of leadership":—"He who has borne the burden and heat of the day learns in bitterness of soul the doom of leadership. To stand in the midst of the *ecclesia*, with the ordinary vicissitudes of man's life transpiring upon one's self from day to day, its variations of mental activity, its episodes of spiritual depression, its yoke of earthly care, its fettering relationships, and yet to behold a thousand souls assembled and waiting for inspiration from one soul; to be conscious perpetually of this silent demand upon one's selfhood; to know that life must be maintained at the giving point, at the point of spiritual exaltation, where influence is generated for the uplift of many souls; to look into the faces of men and women gathered in the house of God, and to see in some the hunger of expectation that must be fed, in others the absence of energy that must be supplied,—that is the doom of leadership." ("Qualifications for Ministerial Power," p. 173). Every faithful pastor is consciously living this doom; many are living it with a disheartening sense of untimely, unforeseen and unnecessary defeat. Within a few weeks a pastor in New England has been reported unable to buy a single book since his

graduation from the theological school several years ago. It is a confession of gathering tragedy, nothing less. The greater tragedy is found in the large numbers of such pastors dwelling amid the dullness of church members who do not buy books themselves and do not know that the minister needs to. You may find in every state numbers of pastors, not all so-called home missionaries, who, not one year, but year after year, cannot afford to attend their own State Conference and often are embarrassed to attend their own local Association. Again the laymen who never think of going are blind to the worth of such provision to the pastor's brain and heart.

These are two main points among others in which our ministry suffers and declines. Corporate duty, ecclesiastical strategy and brotherly love unite in demanding organized effort to turn back this ebbing tide to power. Nor should it be done with an eye solely to individual pastors, though with personal regard for each one. It must be the action of a great branch of the Church of Christ providing for its own leadership for the ends of the Kingdom. We cannot let our leaders go unnourished. We cannot afford to leave our corporate life in the hands of weak men; and the case is worse when inherently strong men go weak through lack of sustenance than when weak men are enabled to do their best; it is the latter situation on which the divine blessing may be expected.

If it be asked what can be done on this line, the answer is in part ready; correspondence courses of study and reading, summer schools or institutes, circulating libraries, pastoral tours through remote regions, such as have proved so profitable in New York State, pastoral exchanges between centres and circumference. A great body of churches administering cordially such a purpose will not be at a loss for timely measures. Pastors who are unable to buy books must be provided with them by gift or loan. Pastors whose studious opportunities were brief and habits poorly formed must be given further training. Pastors who cannot reach the stimulating atmosphere of our Congregational meetings, our large churches and our mighty cities must be brought there or have the energy of these transported to them. We cannot afford, for the sake of our corporate well-being, in

duty to the Kingdom, to let our leaders stop reading and learning and thinking and greeting the new morning with a cheer. Hitherto it has been almost completely left to the individual, solitary there in his isolated parish. It has been every man for himself, and when he can no longer keep the pace, Christ have mercy on him! A beginning of better fraternity and strategy has been made. About a dozen states have arranged courses of reading which are recommended to partially trained men, but which are confessedly of small value. There are summer schools and institutes here and there, useful, but limited. Some of our seminaries earnestly try to make their resources helpful, as when Andover assembles the home missionary pastors of Massachusetts for ten days of instruction and spiritual uplift, or when Hartford invites pastors and physicians to a course of lectures on Religion and Medicine, or when Atlanta maintains continual plans which carry her influence throughout the Gulf States. In many sections surely, though I have meagre reports thereon, at least a little is done to give men the privilege of attending state meetings or district congresses, or to visit the cities, touch the pulse beat of the great churches, and catch step with the marching throng. At this moment, as often in these lectures, I catch myself speaking as a Westerner in eastern conditions where my words sound alien and impertinent. Does any pastor in New England need to be helped to a city or to a central meeting? Lacking railroad fares, he finds the walking short. In California—and to some degree in other states—we have pastors whose fares to San Francisco are from \$15 to \$25 each way, and the running time a night and a day. A Sunday exchange is far beyond reach; the visit of a fellow minister rarer than other theophanies. Leave such pastors to themselves, and your prayers for them ring hollow. Leave them to themselves, and your devotion to home missions, to the growth of Congregational power, to the advance of the Kingdom, lacks wisdom at a main point.

In fine, the personal welfare and industrial efficiency of our ministers through the burden and heat of the day are coming to form a chief concern of our churches. In part by increased salaries, in part by methods of intellectual and spiritual supply, we purpose to do tardy justice to those who go out under the

crushing ends of our common load, we purpose to organize victory in regions where we have remained indifferent to inefficiency or defeat.

IV. When we organize the case of our professional leaders, we shall not stop short of another provision, viz., that of support in sickness and old age. In this we are behind other branches of the Church,—of course we are; this is corporate work, and we have been individualists. Now we all know in what caustic language this matter can be attacked by a well-to-do individualist, and in what cold and unsympathetic words the argument can be laid against pauperizing manhood. But there stands here a problem in righteousness and brotherhood, to be solved without prejudice, with appreciation of fortitude and sacrifice in terribly stringent conditions, and with a sharp conscience of justice instead of charity.

What does the Church demand of its ministers? Nothing, some one replies; the young man who enters the ministry takes his own risks and must not complain. Happily this is not the universal reply, and yet many of us have fallen in with it, and the age has dropped toward a commercial conception of the ministry. But God will never suffer this conception to prevail. If this matter of the Church and her leaders is a business matter, it is spiritual business. It is engaged with God upon the spirit of man. The ministry is a vocation. The Church recognizes the divine call and adjusts its call to that. The Church cannot take pleasure in that easy running in and out of the ministry of which we see lamentably much today. It is not a business or profession to be lightly assumed with a calculating eye and presently to be discarded as unprosperous. It is the highest of vocations, to be entered with a lifelong purpose and uncalculating devotion. The Church demands the entire life of its ministers, their undivided attention and their unswerving purpose unto death. And quality of ministerial work is clearly seen to be in direct proportion to such unreserved and dateless consecration. With less than this churches often put up, but the church is never satisfied. Really providential interruptions are understood. But the Church's conception of the sacred calling stands at the ideal

height, and the Church's demands upon her ministers abate nothing from the man's total gift of himself and all that he hath.

Now the Church knows well enough where this brings a minister out in old age. He has made no material provision for himself; he could not; the Church would not permit him; it would not even allow him normal self-preservation; he is worn out untimely, and a younger man is called to his parsonage and pulpit — "business is business!" Oh, but our vaunted individualism has led to such heartless evictions of faithful servants and such shameless denials of corporate responsibility for our brethren! Even now, with our clearer vision, we are making no haste to rectify our action, as Secretary Ives of Connecticut, or Secretary Rice of New York, could show us. But the better days will come, more dutiful on our part as a church, more sustained and relieved for servants of Christ worn out in the warfare.

It is a day of old-age pensions. The British and German governments exhibit them on the largest scales, while they are seen on all sides in smaller forms. More centralized denominations than ourselves have this provision in full operation for their ministries. We must follow them, for we cannot come near meeting the case by enlarged salaries.

But one thing we must cease; we must cease calling this a charity; it is not charity, it is *quid pro quo*; it is well-earned payment for labor rendered; it is barely living wages for a life clean forspent in our service. Our gifts cannot match the desert. God will assure "the wages of going on and not to die." But let us meanwhile give the bread and water, yea, the butter and honey, in a way worthier of us and of them. A comparison is sometimes made in a way that seems to me mistaken between the ministry and the army and navy. There is more of a parallelism here than is usually stated. The government pays more adequate salaries and retires its officers on half pay, because, it is said, the government gets the total service of the life, whereas the Church cannot command this. I submit that this is blinking facts and obligation. From the hour when the young man enters the pastorate, and shall we not say when he enters the seminary, the Church commands his total sacrificial

service under a command more regal and a constraint more potent than those of the State. In daily quality, in faithfulness, in completeness of sacrifice the Church gets a service unmatched by the State; the State's servants give nobly, even Christianly in many cases, but the Church's servants give *more* divinely, for their lives run nearer God's. But my point is that you call for their all, and you get it; *you get it*; the cases wherein you do not get it are beneath notice. When, then, the State's faithful servants are retiring in fair measure of comfort on half pay, how shall your spiritual servants fare? Connecticut is one of the best furnished of all our Congregational states, and I do not know the details of your administration; but in many states the pittance doled out to extreme cases of privation, and to such only, cannot truthfully be called proper return for service rendered or gift at all worthy of the giving Church. The trouble is not with the committees which administer the funds; the trouble is with the funds. This matter must be shaped up on higher principles than the mere prevention of starvation. Far more than that is due to the sick or aged servant himself and his family. And beyond the obligation to him and them stretches the large matter of administrative wisdom. The ministry as a factor in our church life, deprived of the means of self-provision, must not be left to run out into an old age beginning earlier than in other callings and wandering off into cool dismissal, neglect and oblivion. It is more than injustice; it is poor policy. The evils of it do not escape the young men we want in the ministry, do not fail to affect the total product of church work, and surely do not meet the approval of the Judge who doeth right.

I would not be understood to mean that the Church should bring all its ministers under the working of such a policy. It could not, for *they would* not. Most of them manage to escape this recourse. As we do justice in other respects, a smaller proportion will need it. Perhaps it can one day be brought well-nigh to an end. Meanwhile the high potencies of Christian manhood will continue to carry our ministers and their families bravely, and for the most part silently, through.

V. There are other things to be done toward restoring our ministry to its place of power. General conditions vitally affecting pastoral efficiency, felt by many ministers, perceived by young men looking that way, can be much improved. Some of them are actually better than reported; in these cases the facts need to be shown up.

Freedom of thought and speech is one of the points emphasized in most of the articles upon the ministry of late years. The supposed dearth of this freedom is said to be almost the chief deterrent upon college men. They get the idea that the ministry may not deal honestly and fearlessly with truth, following wherever it leads, uttering it without fear or favor. They note that even yet ministers here and there suffer ecclesiastical discipline for their theological holdings and pulpit teachings, or move on to escape disagreement with the center aisle. That such things have utterly ceased from the Congregational domain cannot be affirmed. We seem tolerably unanimous against iron creeds and the sport of heresy-hunting. We have no tribunals for reducing domineering pews, and holding church committees to honorable and considerate treatment of pastors. And we continue to believe it more suitable, usually, for a pastor to suffer and depart than to wage even a just and victorious warfare likely to result in a torn and bleeding church. But, we, the ministry and members of the Congregational churches, have it in our power, first, to improve still further our conditions of free faith and untrammelled speech, and second, to make it clear to all the world, and to students, that unhappy experiences of this kind are to remain as near zero among us as anywhere in the world of free thought, and that a young man and a minister would better gird up his manhood and march on unshrinking past this lion,—he is chained, and most of him is stuffed.

Personal opportunity for self-realization and useful achievement is another point heavily criticised to the detriment of the ministry. In many departments of action today such opportunity is magnificent. Practically limitless resources in an open field challenge man's utmost aspiration and endeavor. The ministry appears to be disadvantaged in this regard. The high-hearted young man says he doubts the open field, the resources of action,

the progressive character of the churches, the adequacy of church funds, the enterprise of church plans, the breadth of view, the stride forward which is so thrilling in some other lines. Now this is a most sensitive point with a normal man up to say fifty years of age. The man worth while in the ministry demands first of all the chance of life. This is the prime inquiry; not for comfort or recognition, but a great field of freedom and resource whereon to render to his God the noblest account of himself. You will not answer him by pointing to a score of our leading churches with a remark about room at the top. He is not an individualist. He has accepted the age of combination. He thinks the Church should act with as wide a reach and as long a purpose as does industry or education or philanthropy or statesmanship. Such scope he would prefer to find elsewhere than to miss it in the ministry. A large fraction, I for one believe a major fraction, of our 6,000 Congregational ministers are already restive with our conservative hesitation to adopt frankly the more efficient organization. In an age of concerted action they do not see, among some thousands of independent churches rather gingerly holding hands, a rich chance to make full account of their lives. And they are right. The opportunity of our ministry will not be commensurate with that in other departments of modern life until the Congregational churches have achieved a national unity on a grand scale,—repeating Mr. John Fiske's words from the former lecture. This is no ungodly lust after a bishopric; it is the righteous and timely demand to join a great body of men who like to march out together into the great issues where two put ten thousand to flight. I know we have many men who prefer to chase a thousand alone,—God bless them!

VI. It is time to formulate what is coming to be, I believe, our all but unanimous conception of the ministry. And here I must, in the interest of frankness, acknowledge my disagreement with Mr. Heermance, whose chapter on the ministry seems to me the only incorrect one in his valuable volume. With many affirmations and denials in this chapter all Congregationalists are in full accord. We are as far as ever from the sacerdotal

idea of the ministry as an exclusive and governing priesthood. We stand for "a *ministry*, not an order of priests." We subscribe as heartily as ever to the statement adopted by the Council of 1865, as follows:—"The ministry of the gospel by members of the churches who have been duly called and set apart to that work implies in itself no power of government, and ministers of the gospel not elected to office in any church are not a hierarchy, nor are they invested with any official power in or out of the churches." But this has ceased to be a sufficient statement of the position and character of our ministry. It does not lead logically into the old pastoral theory of the ministry advocated by Mr. Heermance as earlier by Dr. Dexter. That theory was that the ministry was no larger than the pastorate, that a man entered the ministry only by assuming the pastorate of a local church and ceased from the ministry upon laying down that pastorate. Involved in this were several things, some of which have permanent validity, some not. The minister was chosen out of the membership of the church he was to serve; or if not, he must at once become a member of it. His ordination was mere induction into that limited pastorate, was of course an action of that one church, and was to be repeated, as affirmed in the Cambridge Platform, if he ever entered upon the pastorate of another church. Between pastorates he had no standing as a minister, though he might be looked upon as worthy and experienced.

Now this pastoral theory became almost at once in early New England too small to cover the facts. The churches held the ministry in higher esteem and administered it upon a larger view. Ordination became a social act, performed by representatives of the churches. The ordained man was considered a minister beyond the bounds of his own parish, and his official acts properly ministerial wherever performed. In 1812 the General Conference of Connecticut asserted that the ordained man remained amenable to discipline when out of a pastorate. Repeated ordination to the ministry gave way to installation into the pastorate, already a different matter in Congregational eyes. Dismissal from a pastorate ceased to be deposition from the ministry. The close of the last pastorate of a lifetime was not

ipso facto departure from the ministry. The man's standing in the eyes of men, his responsibility to the Congregational order, his right to officiate temporarily in any church that invited him, — in short, his full ministerial character and power, both in the church and before the law of the land, abode upon him, and in their sacred folds was he buried however late and full of years. He himself, indeed, might lay off his ministerial character by definite act of withdrawal. He might, if unworthy, be stripped of it, but, as Congregationalists have jealously protested, only by a similar body to that which ordained him, viz., a council convened for that specific purpose. This is not the practice of the pastoral theory of the ministry, any more than it is of the sacerdotal theory. Neither, it should be added, must we keep on affirming the obsolete pastoral theory in order to save our practice from slipping over into the sacerdotal theory. Nor, be it further added, is it the Presbyterian theory. In that scheme the minister is not a member of a church at all, but of a presbytery. He is thus part of a body which is above the churches and has authority in the churches. And it is by this body that he is, humanly speaking, made a minister. Between this and the Congregational practice here advocated there is a gap which we have neither reason nor willingness to bridge. It is, I believe, possible to formulate our ministerial theory and Congregationally safe to practice it in accordance with the larger facts thus presented and the wider social order of the present day.

In our polity, then, the ministry is greater than the pastorate. I like Dr. Ross' putting of it as a function in the Church-Kingdom. It is an order or range of service in the Kingdom and the Church. It is not outside the Church, and we rightly hold our ministers to church membership. It is not above the Church, not a hierarchy with governing power over the churches. It is only by way of the pastorate that it becomes official in the churches. A minister must be a pastor or be invited to perform pastoral service in order to get the office and opportunity of leadership in any church. The ministry, as distinguished from the pastorate, is to be found not merely in the churches, but in and among them in a pervasive sense. It belongs to the churches in common, to the Church Catholic. It is a service to the Church

at large, ready to define itself upon invitation into a pastorate of any local church at any time. This distinction discloses the safety enjoyed by every Congregational church with reference to the body of men called the ministry. No one of these men, nor all of them combined, can enter the field of any local church for the purpose or by the power of any official action, save upon that church's invitation and for the term of that church's pleasure.

Being such, the ministry is in our Congregational view a lifelong function. We do not hold that ordination confers an indelible character. It rather recognizes a divine call into a sacred and permanent vocation. It seems clear to us that God has such an enduring service of religion and calls men into it. It is the number of men called of God into the lifelong service of religion and the Church that we, in common with all Christians, mean by the ministry. At this point, as distinctly as at any, we repudiate the pastoral theory with its temporary character. We mean to ordain only such men as have entered upon a long engagement with God.

Let us, then, frankly accept the implications of this conception. We ordain a man to the ministry of Jesus Christ, we install him into the pastorate of a particular church. We should no longer hesitate at general ordination to the ministry apart from installation into a pastorate. There is no reason in the character of Congregational ordination, though there may be special and personal reasons, against taking the graduating class of this or any Seminary and ordaining them together in one great day to the Christian ministry, to go their several ways into pastorates or evangelism or religious education or the mission field as the Spirit may lead them. In parts of our country, perhaps not here in New England, we are frankly practicing such general ordination. And so logical and practical is it, that it seems likely to win its way, aided by the modern decline of installation and the increasing brevity of formal pastorates.

We should also cease to claim for the local church the exclusive right to ordain. That belongs with the pastoral, not with the Kingdom theory of the ministry. The right of every church to invite any man to officiate as its pastor is not to be denied,

nor its right to call a council to ordain a candidate. The Congregational churches may, indeed, prefer to retain this method of getting at the ordination of new men. But let us discharge our minds of the fiction that the meaning of this method is that ordination is the prerogative of a single church, a sacred part of its wonderful autonomy, while the co-operation of other churches in ordination is social courtesy and a good display of church fraternity. It is time to hold and practice the larger idea that the Congregational Church — Congregational Churches, if the phrase is preferred — provides itself — or themselves — with a ministry. The ordination of a candidate is the act of the Church at large, performed by the churches of a vicinage acting co-ordinately and representing not a single church but the total denomination. Nor need we wait for the individual church to initiate the procedure and give the churches right and occasion to ordain. Ordination should be by that body, viz., the local Association of churches, to which we safely entrust the standing of ministers; and the Association should be ready to meet for ordination at the call of its own officers, upon the request either of a local church or of the candidate himself. And even if ordination by a council of churches is still preferred, it should be as competent and orderly for an association of churches as for a single church to call that council. The provision, be it repeated, of an unfailing line of men discharging the ministerial function in the Kingdom and the Church is the duty and prerogative of the Church, or of the churches corporately, not singly.

This may sound heretical to many mature and ecclesiastically jealous Congregational ears. It may therefore be necessary to protest once more that this is not a process of Presbyterianizing the Congregational ministry. It will not have escaped your thought that the self-control of each local church still remains uninvaded. Though the churches act corporately in filling the ranks of the ministry, they cannot thrust a single minister into the pastorate of any church nor withdraw a pastor. Our ministers remain members of local churches and so amenable to ordinary church discipline. A church is as free as ever to advance one of its own members for temporary service in its own

pulpit, as free as ever to request other churches to unite in ordaining a promising candidate. And ordination by Association, which will be brought forward in another lecture, is no less completely in the control of the churches than is ordination by council. The larger conception of the ministry does not elevate the ministry above the churches, nor give it power over the churches. And be it further protested that here is no attempt to produce a new conception of the Congregational ministry or to alter our Congregational practice. The attempt is to state clearly, albeit with cordial approval, what is believed to be the increasing belief and practice, the truer and foreordained idea. It is offered, too, as a most significant element in our denominational reconstruction. The achievement of a national unity on a grand scale involves such enlarged administration of the ministry. And there exists no more important point in Congregational statesmanship. The welfare of our churches and the fruitage of their work depend under God upon their ministerial leadership. The full ranks, personal quality and efficiency of that leadership depend upon the most commanding conception of it wrought out into the most liberal and engaging opportunity of service. Here is our supreme strategy. There is all to gain and nothing to lose in it. It makes for manhood, vision, power. The ministry wants, not to be carried, but to be challenged and enabled. There is no danger of enfeebling and pauperizing such a body of Christ-called men. Give them room and resources. Then make your scrutiny of candidates searching, your selection rigid, your demands heavy, the battle fierce all the day long, the sacrifice a whole burnt offering; these men will keep full ranks, will fight the fight, will finish the course, will keep the faith, — and with God be the rest!

CHARLES SUMNER NASH.

*Pacific Theological Seminary,
Berkeley, Calif.*

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.

On the evening of December second, at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, there assembled a body of delegates whose coming together deserves well to be considered epoch making in the history of western Christianity. These delegates represented directly and responsibly thirty-three Christian denominational Churches whose total communicant membership amounts to eighteen millions and whose constituency is fairly estimated as comprising half the population of the nation.

The coming together of such a body was the result of a movement the development of which has reached through fourteen years. In 1894 at a meeting in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York, the Open and Institutional Church League was organized. This association brought together representative men from the leading denominations whose fellowship was in a common spirit and method in the promoting of Church work. At about the same time and in somewhat the same spirit there was brought together in New York the Federation of East Side Workers, which came to be the New York Federation of Churches and Christian Workers, the success of which has been conspicuous under the effective direction of its secretary, Rev. Walter Laidlaw, D.D. By joint action of the New York Federation of Churches and Christian Workers and the Open and Institutional Church League in 1899 there was formed the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers. This organization was purely voluntary and in its membership only individuals and local Churches or Institutions for Christian work were comprised. By action of this organization, begun at its annual meeting in Washington in 1902 in inviting the several denominations, as such, to a National Federation Conference, the Inter-Church Conference on Federation

met in New York in 1905. This Conference of 1905 was remarkable for the number and personnel of its delegates and for the breadth, wisdom and force of its discussions and actions. While considering a program which included the great departments of Christian activity and Church work the Conference devoted its most earnest consideration to the object for which it was called together, namely the forming of an Inter-Church Council in which should be represented all the Protestant Churches of the country. The result of these deliberations was the submission of the "Plan of Federation," to the several constituent bodies of the Conference of 1905. The preamble of this "Plan of Federation" is as follows:

WHEREAS in the providence of God the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Saviour, and to promote the spirit of fellowship, service and co-operation among them, the delegates to the Inter-Church Conference on Federation assembled in New York City do hereby recommend the following Plan of Federation to the Christian bodies represented in this Conference for their approval:

The objects of this Federal Council are defined as follows:

- I To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.
- II To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
- III To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual council concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the Churches.
- IV To secure a larger combined influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.
- V To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities.

It is specified in the Plan that this Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it, and that it shall have no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or worship, or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies which constitute it. Representation in the Federal Council is fixed at four members for each constituent body, as such, and one additional member for every

fifty thousand of its communicants, or major fraction thereof. The Plan of Federation thus submitted in 1905 has during three years been submitted to and accepted by thirty-three of the denominational Churches of the United States, and upon this Plan the first session of the Federal Council was convened in Philadelphia.

The program of the meeting of the Council consisted of the consideration of sixteen distinct departments of the activity of the Churches in which all the Churches represented might be fairly presumed to be interested. These departments were as follows: Weekday Instruction in Religion; Interdenominational Organizations; Co-operation in Foreign Missions; State Federations; Local Federations; Organization and Development; The Maintenance of the Council; The Church and the Immigrant; The Church and Modern Industry; Home Missions; Temperance; Sunday Observance; Family Life; Religious Instruction in Higher Institutions; International Relations; Religious Instruction through the Sunday School.

The presentation of each of these departments had been intrusted by the Program Committee to a large special committee representing the different denominations and different sections of the country, care being taken to appoint as chairman of each of these special committees a man experienced in the particular matter assigned and of the executive ability requisite to formulate and present a practical report. The reports of these several committees made through their chairmen were printed in a pamphlet of 176 pages, including the program of the meeting and a list of the delegates, which was presented to each delegate at the first session. No provision for "set" speeches at the Business Sessions of the Council was made. The chairmen of each of the special committees was given ten minutes in which to offer resolutions on the basis of the findings of his committee in the report already printed and in the hands of the delegates. The resolutions were then open to discussion from the floor of the Council and in every case keen, active and enthusiastic discussion was had in bright, pithy, effective speeches limited to five minutes each. To a Congregationalist, familiar with National Council and State Conference programs,

overloaded with oratorical speeches and learned essays, the amount of light and heat thrown upon these vital interests of the Churches by this business-like arrangement of the program was a revelation.

The evening sessions of the Council were devoted to inspirational addresses on subjects related to the practical matters considered at the business sessions. One evening was the opening session with congratulatory addresses. One evening was devoted to Foreign Missions, another to Home Missions, another to the Young People and another to a Reception given by the Philadelphia committee on hospitality. These evening sessions, however, were of greater interest to the people of Philadelphia than to the body of the delegates and were, presumably, designed for that end.

The question is of course properly asked, what are the results of such a meeting? I think it may be answered, that, first of all, the meeting of this Council, representing the denominations as denominations, reported widely though meagerly through the newspapers, and it is to be hoped, more fully though less widely, through the various religious weeklies, has given expression to the fellowship and catholic unity of the Protestant Churches of the country. It has never been true that these denominations have been essentially, or as a whole, at strife one with another. Difficulties and disagreements, friction and rivalry have always been partial or upon unessential matters. But in the absence of any properly constituted body to bear witness to this truth the charge of bitter sectarianism has been too generally thought a just charge. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America bears witness to a unity which has been, which is and which shall be in ever larger measure.

In the second place, the Council gives expression to the common conscience of the Churches with respect of many of the conditions of modern life. For example, upon the question of the Immigrant the Council expresses the welcome of the Churches for the stranger, the recognition by the Churches of his right to come and his right to stay, and of the duty of the Churches to minister to his religious needs. Upon the question of Sunday observance the Council expresses the conviction of the Churches

that the law of God reserves and protects from the abuses of pleasure and the uses of business alike the Lord's Day in the interest of humanity. In the matter of temperance the Council expresses the conviction of the Churches as to the ravages wrought by the liquor traffic in the life of society and the duty of Christian men individually and of the Churches together to give themselves to the banishment of this foe of the common weal from the common life. Upon the matter of family life the Council expresses the conviction of the Churches as to the sanctity of marriage and urges such co-operative action of the various denominations as will diminish the prevalence of divorce and tend to the preservation of the family life and the Christian home. Upon the matter of international relations the Council expresses the conviction of the Churches as to the futility and iniquity of war as a means of the settlement of international disputes under modern conditions. Upon the matter of modern industry, which includes the vexed relations between capital and labor as well as the ground in dispute between the individualist and the socialist, the Council gave unanimous and enthusiastic endorsement to the report of its committee, which affirms the gospel of Jesus and the teachings of the New Testament as the final authority in the social as well as in the individual life, which confesses that "the Church has not always spoken when it should have borne witness", which recognizes in the present social and economic conditions "the most significant crisis and the greatest opportunity" in the history of the Church. The report urges "tolerance, patience and mutual conference" in industrial disputes, recognizes the natural right of men to organize for common ends and endorses the claims of labor for many rights and reforms, among others the right "to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change", the abolition of child labor, the suppression of the sweating system, "the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be divided", and the abatement of poverty.

In the third place it should be the result of the Council that great moral pressure shall be brought to bear upon those missionary operations which are carried on by the denominations in such

wise as to eliminate even the suspicion of rivalry and to reduce waste, either of men or of money, to the lowest possible minimum. Discussions upon this matter on the floor of the Council made it evident that already on many foreign fields greater co-operation has been secured, and in some instances, more effective actual union brought about than is yet possible in our own land. All our home missionary enterprises ought to gain hope and take counsel from the unanimity with which the delegates at this meeting expressed themselves with respect to the aggressive work of the Churches throughout the country.

In the fourth place such a meeting as that just held with those that shall follow it, according to the plan approved, once in four years, will promote mutual acquaintance among those responsible for the activities of the several denominations, and will nourish mutual respect and affection among the leaders of the Churches which cannot but be reflected more and more as time goes on in the front rank and file of their membership.

In the fifth place, the volume of the printed proceedings of the Council will offer for the use of the Churches a mass of expert testimony and counsel concerning the various activities of the Churches which will be exceedingly useful to all those concerned for their common work.

ROCKWELL HARMON POTTER.

Hartford, Conn.

SOME THINGS TO EMPHASIZE IN PREACHING.

We look first at the preacher's task, which is to build up character in Christian principle. We ministers stand before our people, knowing that in the moments of public worship we bring them "the deep and dear facts of life and love, the great lines of destiny."

Sharp criticisms from every side disturb our ease. Says Prof. Momerie, "If the church is to live, not merely as an establishment, but in any form at all, preaching must be either abolished or reformed." People say they want preaching, but their state of mind reminds us of a recruit in Coxey's army who said "We don't know what we want, but we want something awful bad, and we want it awful quick."

In our perplexity and dismay we sometimes feel, as we think of our sermons, as an amateur artist felt when he asked a friend how much he ought to get for his picture, and the candid friend replied, "about six months." One urges, "preach the old Gospel," and omits an explanation how to make it new. A distinguished minister said his mother exacted from him a promise to preach so that every sermon would contain a call to Christ. That cannot mean a repetition of dear, familiar phrases. What would you think of a professor of engineering who should tell his classes that since all discoveries in mathematics depend on a clear knowledge of first principles he would refuse to cater to the restlessness of the present and a love for novelty and content himself every day by reciting the old truths of the multiplication table.

We all agree that the business of the minister is to preach Christ; he is a minister of the gospel, God's revelation of eternal life: a gospel which meets every need of human life, rebuilds manhood and prepares for a long career. We are called to enter every field of thought, use any subject, truth or argument which shall establish men in Christian character and the practice of

Christian principle. The minister knows no secular field which should not be penetrated by the gospel. It is a vast area sweeping on past the judgment; but our business is with seriousness, tenderness and awe to insist that eternal sanctions and laws must control our daily living and regulate our decisions and conduct.

We must deal with questions of the hour. We cannot hope to interest the people if we do not; they live in the present. There is a danger of catering to the present. A minister of the Church of England in a floating Bethel, whose zeal surpassed his controversial reading, was asked whether his Bethel was High Church or Low Church, replied, "That depends entirely on the tide." We must watch the tide and control it.

It requires a level head, a sense of humor, and no end of Christian principle, to handle the truths which ought to be presented in the light of the Bible and the present Christ. We really ought to be fine, broad, noble-hearted men: and we *must* interest people else they may repeat to us the lines of Crabbe's Convert.

"That from your meetings I refrain, 'tis true;
I meet with nothing pleasant, nothing new,
But the same proofs that not one thing explain,
And the same lights when all things dark remain."

Our dryness is not always due to the depravity of the people who slumber before us, but sometimes to shadows of puritanism upon us which overlook the grace of humor and that side of our nature which is as divine as solemnity.

The preacher is the only orator in the world who neglects the power of laughter in pleading for life and death.

We are fishers of men. Dullness is an unpardonable sin. Questions of the hour need discussion in the light of Christ and common sense: any other notion would imply that the gospel is a system of barren abstractions with no bearing on daily life. Our fear should be, not that we shall widen the field too much but that we shall make it too narrow. If a sinful practice is going on in the community and the preacher does not strike it, he fails in duty. Beecher said: "It seems to me to be a very dangerous thing to preach Christ so that your preaching shall not be a constant rebuke to all the evil in the community." What interest of

a man is aloof from the gospel? And if we do not so use the moments of worship that the secular life shall be more intelligently Christlike, pure, rich, strong, of what value is preaching?

Preaching is building Christian character.

We need also to understand the times. There are three facts which deserve special attention.

First, the prevalence of the idea of evolution. A half century ago Darwin published the "Origin of Species" and the thought of our time is filled with its spirit to such a degree that it is hard to believe that we cannot outgrow even sin. This widespread principle tends to weaken the sense of responsibility even more than the strict determinisms of a century and a half since. Heredity and environment are held responsible for evil and the moral sense is poisoned at its source. Many think that evils will disappear if only society can be reorganized: the fact of sin in the individual as the seat of all evil is overlooked, and a false optimism encouraged which leads men to believe that sin will be left behind in the onward march of civilization.

Another fact which deserves careful attention is this, that we have broken loose from tradition and must readjust many of our habits. The old methods of thinking of the Bible, observing the Sabbath, and amusements have passed away. Formerly there were certain unwritten laws in Christian communities about novel-reading, dancing, and many other "worldly" pleasures. Secular papers and books, letter-writing, and driving, except to church, were contraband on the Sabbath. These theories have passed away. Every one must now find out how to keep the day with the result that it is seldom kept at all. The word "worldly" has almost ceased to be used. Freedom to think and live as one may choose often passes into license, and there is need of a deep, broad view of the principles of the kingdom in this age of reconstruction.

A third fact is this, that we are living in an age of great material wealth; many are content to repeat Parker Pillsbury's dying words to Thoreau who asked him what new idea he had caught of the coming life, as he stood on the margin, "Henry, one world is enough at a time." The pulpit must stand for a

broader view than that. Our hearers should say when returning from church, "There are interests more valuable than money; my fears have been removed; my hopes strengthened; my ideals elevated; my weakness and discouragements lessened; Christ seems more real and kingly; heaven nearer; a life of courage and honor grander; there is an eternal life of righteousness and blessedness which dwarfs my petty ambitions."

This leads us to ask, where should we put our emphasis?

First of all on the positive message of Christ as the infinite Son of God and able to meet every human need. Believing that all men are God's children, whom Christ restores to the Father, our message should be given with the downward slide.

It is time for the pulpit interrogation mark to hear the sunset gun. The upward inflection tires. The affirmative, the positive are needed today. People have doubts enough of their own. The best apologetic is a clear, straight message. A powerful gospel is iron in the blood, certainty in the voice, conviction in the soul.

If we really believe that sin is dangerous, cruel, deadly, and that Christ delivers, how can we be other than positive preachers? Men and women burdened, discouraged, indifferent, perplexed, look to their minister to float them heavenward; equip for temptation; strengthen for struggle; prepare them to face the near and distant future with a cheer; to cause the beacon to flame brightly

"When the light is low,
When the blood creeps, and the nerves prick
And tingle, and the heart is sick,
And all the wheels of being slow."

The minister needs to have with every sermon the conviction that the truth it conveys comes straight from the Christ of the twentieth century for the need of the passing hour to form an event in some life. This will give that sense of newness and vitality which the apostles had. They believed that they went straight with the living Christ; in the grace of Christ to the people, and whenever the sense of newness has weakened the gospel has lost power. Said John McNeill, "God give us to preach a perpetual sense of a glad and wonderful surprise at our own salvation."

The pathetic picture of a cross rising afar above the dreary flats of time must not dim our eyes to the view of Jesus Christ

as very God, who hates saloons, graft, ill-temper, evil-speaking, and meanness of every kind as He does the Prince of Darkness, and offers a royal welcome to every penitent soul whom He would build up into royal character.

The expression of this message will vary in form, but there must be a passage of the clear light of infinite truth living in the eternal Son of God through the preacher's mind to human souls, or the pulpit confuses and hurts.

The preacher may not always be able wisely and conclusively to apply the truth to social unrest, commercial injustice, and intellectual doubt; but he must believe absolutely that there is in the republic of heavenly brotherhood an answer for every question, a solution for every difficulty, a medicine for every hurt, a tonic for every weakness. Christ's ambassador is a thinking lens for the passage of gospel light. Strange if some one some time does not enter the Kingdom while the sermon flashes the heavenly gleam.

A second thing for emphasis is the practicalness of the Kingdom. The clearest definition of the Kingdom I have seen is "the world of invisible laws by which God is ruling and blessing His creatures."

It is the business of the preacher to so live in the Kingdom and explain it that its principles shall appear as real as gravitation, the laws of the state or government bonds. He must see the lostness of an impenitent life, and agree with Canon Liddon when he says, "If our age has outgrown the phrase 'the salvation of the soul,' so much the worse for the age." The minister is not a moral policeman, or a conductor on a trunk line to heaven, or a superintendent of a cyclopedia of mild and beneficent endeavors.

In our reaction from the "other-worldliness" idea and our eagerness to keep abreast of the latest fad, we should avoid the temptation to think that psychotherapy is on a level with repentance; alleviation of insomnia in the same class with faith in Christ; and conducting a swimming tank as important as baptism. A holy life is natural and happy. Sin is unnatural, the Kingdom's invisible laws are here, and its resources ample for the humbled, footsore, hungry children of the Father.

The Christian ideal of life and conduct needs applying to the workshop, the mill, the home; it is meant for employer and employed. Many bear the burden of "duty unfulfilled" because they are not sure what their duty is. The minister who clearly, convincingly, and practically applies spiritual laws to every day life; who helps people to see exactly what it is for them to be Christians; who preaches "as though Christ were the head of the firm," is doing the work to which he is called. Many care as much for Moses as for Julius Cæsar, and for David as for Peter the Hermit, but all are facing a stern, hard, delusive world, and it is the preacher's task to show the friendliness of Jesus, the fullness of His helpfulness for every hour, and the bearing of the Kingdom upon the whole of life. Charles Ferguson says, "It is a superficial judgment that this is a sordid and God-forgetting age, because it is occupied with questions of board and clothes, and bent on getting them settled right. It is the greatness of the age that it is engrossed in economics, and that it sees in tangible things wrought by the labor of men, sacramental values, and the materials of religion. This is the beginning of a new order of things more beautiful and joyous than has yet been on the earth." I believe that this is absolutely true and the pulpit is the opportunity for a clear-sighted, deep-thinking, warm-hearted man to bring the eternal laws and sanctions of the Kingdom into the despairing, perplexing, sinful ways of men.

The last point for emphasis I will mention is summoning men to face God in their present responsibility. Reacting from the preaching which called men to meet an angry judge armed with deathless terrors, we must fear lest we present God as a mild and fatherly old gentleman, too polite to hurt any one. Our theology is defective if we think that human fatherhood is deep and broad enough to represent the Fatherhood of One who is our Creator and the infinite Reason as well as Father. We are untrue to the Bible, the intrenched sins and defiant moods of selfish men if the pulpit does not become a frequent rehearsal of what used to be described as a standing before the great white throne. Flowers and rose water will not take the place of pressing home to the conscience the sinfulness and peril of an impenitent life. A breeze

from Sinai must play about the mountain of Beatitudes. Tenderness, a keen insight into our own lives and sympathy with our tempted, faltering brothers are needed to place the righteous and loving God before evasive, ingenious and careless men so that they shall give the Kingdom first place in conscience and practice. God is skillful in using strange sermons if the heart of the preacher be sincere, but forensic pictures, dramatic arraignments, in which sternness overshadows reasonableness lie not level to many a man we should gladly win. God's patience must be sorely taxed with the "eternally feminine" note which calls to Jesus because it is healthy to be a Christian. There must be a way of pushing the danger of a sinful life home upon the conscience which is scriptural and up to date if we have earnestness and courage to find and use it. It certainly must be preached so that men shall say "That is true; if I do not repent my pastor has been faithful." Perhaps the best verse to suggest our work here is "As a man soweth so shall he reap." But the preacher stands forth as a representative of the Father's throne. The world expects him to be true to the call; and laughs, pities and passes by if he is weak or shortsighted enough to flinch. Sin is dangerous and unforsaken must be punished. We may use modern terms to describe the peril of the great refusal, but if the pulpit does not call a sharp halt to unrighteousness and lead men to see that they are on the right road or the wrong road, that eternity is long, life precious, and the human will free and responsible for character and destiny, the gospel loses its ring of power.

A treatise would relate other points of emphasis, but these are the ones which seem to me to stand in the first class, a clear, positive message from God to a sinful, redeemed world, the practicalness of the Kingdom for every human experience, and a summons to a present judgment for sin.

GEORGE L. CLARK.

Wethersfield, Conn.

THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.

If any doctrine can be considered vital, surely this one can; let us approach it from the standpoint of life and experience. We must make our beginning, of course, with the nature of sin, for it is from sin that we must be saved. It will be convenient to present sin in four different relations, to natural law, to God as law-giver and judge, to the sinner's conscience, and to God as our Father and the lover of our souls. These various aspects can not be separated in fact, and to isolate them in thought is not wholly feasible; but by doing so it is possible to get a much more adequate idea of the total content of salvation. Under each head will be considered, with necessary brevity, the goal of sin ("when it is finished"), the goal of salvation, the means of salvation God uses, and the thought of the present day thereupon.

First of all, and fundamentally, sin is a violation of natural law. God has no arbitrary commands, and there are no factitious sins. Holiness is fundamentally wholeness, integrity, and every sin involves damage to man's powers. Choosing the lower good rather than the higher, the immediate and small good rather than the remoter and worthier good, choosing the path of self-indulgence and sloth, of greed and lust, always means damage. The goal of sin is the complete perversion of man's nature, so that he hates all that is sober and pure, and cries out with Satan, "Evil, be thou my good;" it is the destruction of man's powers, both of activity and enjoyment. Whether it shall come with sharpest pain or with desperate paralysis, or with a mingling of both, makes no essential difference. The man is lost, his manliness is dead, and the way of death is his choice.

Salvation here must mean vastly more than superficial reform, the prudent selection of some form of selfishness which will give the largest returns at the lowest cost. Fear and hope

as motives have great power in detaching a man from sin, but only as they are assisted by conscience and love. All these motives must work together until the man has become so well acquainted with the higher and nobler good that he really prefers it; until selfishness has been transformed into an intelligent and ennobling self-interest, that always seeks and wins the best. When he has learned to love what he once rejected, and to honor what he once contemned, when his desires and choices are thoroughly wholesome and pure, then and not till then is the man fully saved.

It is not necessary to point out in detail how clear Christ has made it that God seeks only our good. The facts of natural law and man's welfare are so presented in his words as to make the strongest appeal to fear and hope; and his words are all reinforced by his life. If anything could show man the evil of sin, it is Calvary; if anything can reveal the beauty and power of a life of sober self-mastery, it is the story of the man of Nazareth. In no other company are tastes and desires so rapidly rectified; things pure and good become a necessity for the one who walks with Christ.

But our age too often undertakes this companionship lightly, with a strange irresponsibility for the past that has been forsaken. If the man has stopped sowing wild oats, the harvest drops from his thoughts. It is easy to see how fatuous this is in the realm of bodily sin; but it is no less fatuous in the realm of spiritual sins. Many of us sorely need the admonition "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." This is a truth which must not be lost, which should ever accompany its necessary complement, the sense of a personal God who is above natural law, of a personal Christ with divine power to win from evil, of a heavenly Father who can rescue the repentant sinner from many of the consequences of sin, and can make those which remain a school of right thought about the evil of sin. It is good to bring the sinner face to face with law, universal, inescapable. It is not good to leave him alone there.

For law is something more than natural force working along definite and fixed lines; it is the expression of the will of God, who is the ruler of the universe. He has laid definite commands

upon us, and they are furnished abundantly with the sanctions of punishment and reward. The difference between an impersonal tendency and a personal judge is immeasurable, and sin in this relation is new and startling in its evil. "Prepare to meet thy God" becomes a most terrible word; "the Lord will not hold him guiltless" applies to many a command whose violation brings no natural consequences of evil about which the sinner cares at all.

Persistent sin means here the complete perversion of a nature meant to be under personal law; in his opposition to the law of God, the sinner would rather transgress that law than not. And it means the condition of the outlaw, with the extreme penalty of the broken law. What that is can be seen in our sacred scriptures, and with surpassing clearness in the words of Christ. Just as on earth the criminal in heart and life, shut up in state's prison, knows that all the personal forces of civilization are against the life he has chosen and made his own, so the goal of sin is the knowledge that all the law-abiding souls of the universe, with God at their head, are arrayed in energetic and uncompromising hostility to his sinful choice. The man is lost, he is dead; for he chooses the path of death.

How does Christ's salvation come in here? What is punishment for? It is not an end in itself, to be inflicted blindly; we are coming to see that in our own administration of law. On the one hand, its purpose is to reveal the righteousness of God, His eternal opposition to sin; and on the other hand it is to secure the moral health of the universe. Now if something else can make clear God's opposition to sin, that might take so far forth the place of the sinner's punishment. As a fact, God's opposition to sin is much more clear in the story of Calvary than it is in Gehenna; it means much when God makes the sinner suffer for his sin, it means unspeakably more when God himself suffers "for our sins," and reveals those sufferings in Christ. And still further, if the sinner himself can thus be led to see the hatefulness of his lawlessness, and can be drawn away from his sin, then the moral health of the universe has been secured in the fullest possible fashion. Indeed, anything short of this must obviously fall short of the desire of a righteous God, who seeks

to have all men righteous, "who would have all men to be saved."

Our age does not see these truths as widely and as clearly as our grandfathers did. They thought of human law as the expression of God's law in forms adapted to the times. Our laws are looked upon as the expression of the people's judgment and convictions. We make our own laws, often unwisely, and change them whenever we like. There is a great lack of reverence for law, even among good people; and we think little of God as law-giver, and "judge of all the earth." This age needs to rediscover the relations of law to organized society, to see anew the necessity of statute and penalty and judge and judgment. Not until a man sees clearly the justice of penalty in his own case, even with regard to the transgressions that he once thought most attractive and reasonable; not until he himself in all his personal powers is on the side of the law and the judge, is he fully saved. The remission of his penalty is obviously an important and necessary part of salvation; but it is wholly secondary to the free and full choice of a life that abides by the law of the Supreme Ruler.

But the lower good is never perfectly secured until the next higher good is made secure; and this whole discussion of law needs to move up higher to the realm of conscience. God has not only written the law in the constitution of nature, and in the statutes by which He governs the earth; He has written it in the moral nature of man. And this again makes an immeasurable difference. If the sinner's own heart did not condemn him, or if it condemned him for nothing worse than the waste of that which was his own to waste if he wished, the case would be different. If he could face his condemnation by the judge and still retain his self-respect, the case would be different. But he is "without excuse." He has sinned not only against his own good, against the law and the law giver, but against his own conscience. He knows he has done wrong, and the goal of sin is the utter loss of self-respect, the complete self-condemnation of the soul by the severest judge in the universe, the judge from whom he cannot escape even when he departs from God, his own conscience. The man is lost, is dead; for he has chosen the path of death.

What is it to be saved? The rebellious desires must lay down their arms; civil war must cease by the universal recognition of the rightful king; conscience as the vice-gerent of God must rule, with utter disregard of earthly expediency. Not until the man is ready to do what he knows to be right, "though the heaven fall," whatever of present good he must turn from, whatever of evil consequence he must face; not until man believes in the right as wrought, not only into his moral nature, but into the constitution of the universe, and sure to be revealed finally and triumphantly in all the dealings of a righteous God, not until then is he fully saved. The man must come to see that the worst thing about sin is not hell, but that the worst thing about hell is sin; that the best thing about doing the will of God is not heaven, but that the best thing in heaven is doing the will of God. How is he to reach this height? In his extremest need does he look for the supreme example and stimulus? It is to be found in Gethsemane and on Calvary. In his helplessness before the dominion of sin, does he seek an inconceivable power, that can transform his rebellious heart into righteous loyalty? God in Christ is able "to subdue all things unto himself."

We have been climbing in our thought from fear and hope, dealing with the natural and inevitable results of obedience and disobedience, or with the rewards and penalties of a law administered by a personal God, up to the searching sanctions of conscience in a man's own breast. Another ascent remains. God is not only king but father, not only judge but redeemer. He is the lover of our souls, and not until He secures our love can His love be satisfied; and not until we give Him our love can we be satisfied. Here we reach the deepest and broadest and highest fact of the human soul; it is made to receive God's love, and to love God in return. Sin here is a rupture of fellowship; it is the unfilial; it is the leaving the Father's house, and going into a far country to have one's own way. Its goal is the complete perversion of the filial within us, the distrust and hatred of God's way as opposed to our own, the transformation of the Father into the chief antagonist and ultimately the hated warder. Could there be a more dreadful exhibition of the evil of sin? If the father in the parable must say of his rioting son that he was

lost and dead, what shall be said when the wanderer refuses to return? when the hand of the judge is laid upon the persistent sinner, as some day it must be laid? when the unfilial and rebellious son comes to "the weeping and gnashing of teeth"? Have we not here the most compelling presentation of the exceeding sinfulness of sin?

To be saved here is to "come to one's self" with desires for the Father's home; to give up one's own way, and surrender the will to wisdom and love as embodied in the Father. It is to love God's love, and to delight in loving Him. It is to value welfare most of all as expressing God's goodness, and to reverence law most of all as good with all the Father's goodness. It is to delight in conscience most of all, not as the source of the keenest self-respect, but as the means of fellowship with God. Not until every good and right thing is seen in the light and beauty and loveliness of God, is the man fully saved; not until all the sternness and severity of God are seen as fully consistent with God's love, is man fully saved.

How can we fail to see the supreme appeal here in the work of the Atonement! Jesus has given us a new conception of the love of man to man, and of the love of man to God, and above all of the love of God to man. He not only taught it, but lived it; He not only lived in the power of it, but He brought its supreme power to bear upon the world. He gathered up all the potencies of these lower motives, and completed and fulfilled them in this all-inclusive motive of love, which "believes all things and hopes all things." Therefore, most of all, and first of all, is He the Saviour of the World.

Our age has been much more busy with God's love than with God's justice. We see the seeking fatherhood of God, the eagerness to forgive and save, as our grandfathers did not. We see all the attractive and winning aspects of the gospel as they have never been seen before. And seeing how eager God is to help, we too are eager to help. But, without losing this vision, we must learn to hate with God's hate as well as to love with God's love; we cannot understand the depths of God's love if we are careless about sin and law; if we are really to live in the Father's home as sons, we must be in full sympathy with Him in all His

vision of sin, in all that He does against sin. Retribution and redemption both come from the one God, and we do not fully know God, we are not fully saved, until we see their complete harmony.

One further point of comparison ought to be considered. A century ago salvation was conceived in terms of God. God's grace removed the sinner from "under the law"; a miracle of grace transformed the sinner's heart. With all this the sinner had little to do beside the acceptance. The Scotchman who described his conversion by saying "I fought God all I could, and God did the rest," supposed that in thus speaking he was honoring God and exalting salvation.

With us it is otherwise. We see with surpassing clearness the half-truth that man must save himself if he is ever saved; no shifting of labels, no work of divine magic will avail. Man's ability (working with God), and man's complete responsibility—if this age has a shibboleth, it is to be found here. Jesus shows us what salvation is. He is the wisest of teachers, the supreme model, the spiritual leader of the race as it works out its own salvation. All this work of Christ is more fully, more engagingly, more inspiringly presented than ever before. But this is not enough. To bring out all the hidden reserves of man's resources, to raise his ability to the nth power, is not to save him; that can only be accomplished by the power of God, and Christ is that power, the spiritual dynamo from which must come the energy needed to move the human soul along the paths of eternal life. Christ must not only be to us the Way and the Truth, but the Life. We need again to state salvation in terms of God, making God's part as much larger than the vision of our grandfathers as we have made man's part larger. Christ is more than teacher and model and leader; He is the Saviour of the world because he bestows eternal life; without that life this is a helpless and perishing world; with Christ—and Christ is here, never to leave this world, forever to be the one supreme energy in all its unfolding life,—with Christ this is a redeemed world, a world that is being saved.

Just what do we mean when we say that Christ is in the world? On the one hand it stands for the spirit of God, the

spirit of Christ, whose work in the world is the continued life of Christ in the world. On the other hand it stands for His Church, the new incarnation of the Spirit of God, whose work in the world is the continued life of Christ here. The world is to be saved through the redemptive labors of the Church, and these are as absolutely necessary for the salvation of the world as the original redemptive work of Christ. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His." What was the spirit of Christ? He came "to seek and to save the lost." "If any man would follow me, let him take up his cross daily;" and this cross does not mean first of all the doing of painful duties; it means sharing the saving work of Christ, whether it hurts or not. Can a blind man understand light and color? How can we hope to understand Christ's work in saving us, if we refuse to share its sorrows and its joys? The deepest and most essential test of salvation is this: Is the man living to save others, even though the world says of him "Himself he cannot save"? There must be a sin-bearing Church as well as a sin-bearing Christ, if the world is to be saved; yes, if the Church is to be saved.

Here is the greatest lack in our present experience of salvation. On the one hand the weakening of the sense of sin and its peril, on the other hand the excessive emphasis upon freedom of the will and inviolate individuality, combine to diminish our sense of responsibility for the sinner out of Christ. We do not love the wanderer enough, we do not love Christ enough, we do not identify ourselves in love either with the sinner or with Christ as we should. Our salvation is not complete until we are sharers to the utmost of our ability in the saving work of Christ, until with us as it was with Him, that is the one meaning and purpose of our life. So only can it be true that God shall be glorified in the Church, according to the power that worketh in us, as he is glorified in Christ Jesus, for ever and ever. Amen.

STEPHEN G. BARNES.

St. Johnsbury, Vt.

In the Book-World

That there is far too much ignorance, even among ministers, regarding the history of the interpretation of Scripture admits of no doubt. It is true, as Dr. G. H. Gilbert says in the preface to his new work on the *Interpretation of the Bible*, that this is a great but neglected field. No work on the subject appeared in English until Farrar's "History of Interpretation" (1886) and that has had no successor. It was, therefore, a clear field that was before Dr. Gilbert, giving him a large opportunity to so preoccupy it that his work might long remain the standard work on the subject. But, apparently, he did not choose to attempt to give much more than a suggestive outline. Except at one or two points the discussion remains practically where Farrar left it over twenty years ago.

Perhaps it is a criticism that may seem unreasonable, but it strikes us that Dr. Gilbert has erred in making his discussion too brief. His book might easily have been made twice as large and would thereby have gained greatly in value. The history of the interpretation of the Bible covers a long period and includes many names, and also involves the consideration of many and varied conditioning influences. It is too much to try to present all this in a small book of less than three hundred pages. Too many important facts have to be omitted and too little space is devoted to the discussion of the more important periods and personalities. The disastrous effect of these presumably self-imposed limitations is evident on many pages of this work. It need not be said that Dr. Gilbert is deliberately unfair in his treatment of most biblical exegetes from Philo down to modern times. But the fact is, that he writes as an ardent champion of modern scientific exegesis (in itself the only correct method), and in his zeal to point out the defects of nearly all the past exegesis he has not taken sufficient pains to relate each man properly to his environment, to show how he did or did not mark an advance when measured by standards of his own age rather than by those of our times. Take, for example, Calvin, to whom Dr. Gilbert devotes eleven pages. It is true that certain points of Calvin's ability as an exegete are gratefully acknowledged and it is also true that the defects of Calvin's exegesis when measured by the standards of today are real defects. But when Dr. Gilbert says "we are not here concerned to judge the exegesis of Calvin by the standard of the sixteenth century" (p. 212) he practically confesses that he deliberately lays aside as unessential one of the most necessary qualifications for a true understanding of the men and events of any past age. Dr. Gilbert does not intend to be unfair, but the attitude he has chosen and the method he has followed actually compel him to be unfair. Perhaps the exegesis

of this modern "scientific era" may be found to be not altogether perfect.

But this work is not without value. If the reader realizes that he requires a much more sympathetic introduction to the great interpreters of the past, and a fuller knowledge of their methods and spirit than is afforded by a half dozen or so examples of the faulty exegesis of each one he can use Dr. Gilbert's book to great advantage. The two best chapters are perhaps the third, *The Old Testament Interpreted in the New*, and the last, *The Scientific Era of Biblical Interpretation*. Even in these there are many statements that need qualification. When we read (p. 71), that "there is no evidence that Jesus saw a predictive element in the Old Testament," we feel that surely the statement does not mean just what it says, and the author himself labors to qualify the meaning in the discussion preceding and following. Dr. Gilbert's own exegesis of some of Jesus' words is not far from being as dogmatic as he says Calvin's was. (Macmillan, pp. 298. \$1.25.)

E. E. N.

Prof. Karl Marti of Bern is one of the most accomplished Old Testament scholars of today, although probably not known to the majority of English-speaking Bible students. As general editor of the "*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament*," and contributor of some of its most important volumes, and as the reviser of successive editions of Kayser's "*Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion*" (5th ed. 1907), he has shown his mastery of the problems of Old Testament study. It is a fortunate circumstance, therefore, that his recent work "*Die Religion des Alten Testaments*," which was written as a concluding and summarizing section of "the *Kurzer Hand-Commentar*," is now before the English reader, well translated and attractively bound. In this work Dr. Marti seeks to describe *The Religion of the Old Testament* in its historical development from its primitive (nomadic) stage to its final (legal) form. It is not the details of this progressive development, but its main factors that are here set forth with masterly skill. Naturally in an outline sketch such as we have in this book, there are many statements that may seem extreme, or ill-advised. But in this case all such statements rest upon the careful exegetical work in the several volumes of the "*Hand-Commentar*." And it is, after all, surprising that one whose point of view may be much more conservative than the author's, finds so little to criticize in Marti's book. Two points deserve especial recognition. One is the zealous championship of the uniqueness of the O. T. religion among the religions of S. W. Asia. Dr. Marti, like many modern German scholars, does not choose to say much about "revelation" or "inspiration." He prefers to speak of the "inner experience" of men such as Moses, Isaiah, etc. But whatever may be his terminology, he does not seek to belittle the fact that in the O. T. there is something that is unparalleled elsewhere among the religions of humanity. The other point is the evaluation of the religion of the prophets as that which alone is to be recognized as the true religion of the O. T. and as the real anticipation of the religion of Jesus. What Dr. Marti has written on these points is well worth everyone's careful reading. (Putnam, Crown Theological Library, vol. xix, pp. 251.)

E. E. N.

The latest series of brief popular commentaries is entitled "The Bible for Home and School." Its general editor is Prof. Shailer Mathews, who informs the reader that this series "is intended to place the results of the best modern biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader." Among the "chief characteristics" mentioned by the editor the most distinctive are "its rigid exclusion of all *processes*, both critical and exegetical, from its notes," and "its presupposition and its use of the assured results of historical investigation and criticism wherever such results throw light on the biblical texts. Such a method makes possible the production of very brief compact commentaries on the biblical books. In fact, brevity, combined with scholarly accuracy, seems to have been one of the chief ends in view. The first number of the series to appear is on *The Epistle to the Hebrews* by Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed of the University of Chicago. Bearing in mind the limitations imposed by the general plan of the series, Dr. Goodspeed has produced a very excellent little commentary on this difficult book of the N. T. His brief comments treat the most important or the most difficult points in a way that is very satisfactory, provided the reader is content to accept results and cares nothing for the processes through which the results are reached. For the reader who wishes to get behind results a larger commentary or even the small commentary of Prof. Peake in the "New Century Bible" will be found more serviceable. (Macmillan, pp. 132, 50 cts.)

E. E. N.

Dr. Len G. Broughton is well known throughout the South as one of her most effective evangelistic preachers. He has attempted to set forth some of the main points in his theology in a little book entitled *Salvation and the Old Theology*, which consists of a series of popular Bible-talks on Romans. The theology here expounded is perhaps not altogether Pauline. It is "old" in the sense that it is the traditional theology of the Calvinistic creeds. But the book is full of earnest practical religion even though its exegesis of Paul is not always correct. (Revell, pp. 188, 75 cts.)

E. E. N.

Among the volumes in the "Christianity of To-day Series," are several bearing on the life and ministry of Jesus. *Paralipomena*, by Dr. Bernard Peck, consists of the remains of gospels and sayings of Christ, brought together in a volume of about one hundred and thirty pages. The gospels are the apocryphal gospels usually bound in such compilations, and the sayings are from the apocryphal acts and other Christian documents from the Didache to the works of Jerome and Augustine. The translations are almost uniformly good, and the arrangement of the material, references to original sources, etc., are very satisfactory. The bibliography at the end of the volume is of very great merit, being quite comprehensive and lucidly arranged. The volume will be found very useful to students of the life of Christ and early Christian history. (75 cts.)

The Life and Ministry of Jesus, by Rudolph Otto, has been translated from the third edition by Mr. Whitby. The author follows the historical critical method and the result is very meagre. It is safe to say that the volume will not make a very strong appeal to those seeking information concerning the life of Christ. (50 cts.)

What we know about Jesus is told us by Dr. Charles F. Dole. After reading the volume one comes to the conclusion that we know very little about him. The last chapter speaks of certain positive conclusions, among which are the following: that Jesus is not the real authority of the modern man in any church, either in conduct or religion, and that the actual historical man Jesus has long since ceased to be the leader or master in the religious life or in the progress of mankind. (75 cts.)

Jesus and Modern Religion by Edwin A. Rumbell presents another phase of the same general subject. The author mingles the ancient with the modern in a very confusing sort of way, giving us a chapter out of the first century and then one out of the twentieth, using the theme as a connecting link between the old and the new. (75 cts.)

The fifth volume in this series, by Paul Carus, is entitled *God*; "an Inquiry into the Nature of Man's Highest Ideal and a Solution of the Problem from the Standpoint of Science." Part first is entitled "A New Conception of God," and the author ranges all over the universe and discourses on all manner of subjects. The second part is called "Theology as a Science," and here again the author gives loose rein to his imagination and treats of various things, such as general panpathy, the personal equation, theomony, revision of creeds, etc. Part third is called "A Further Elucidation in the Discourse and Controversy," and is composed of quotations, letters, etc., from Hegel, Wilkinson, Amos Waters, Pierre Hyacinthe, and our author. The volume closes with three hymns of considerable merit. (\$1.) The above named works belong in a single class and are written from the standpoint of Paul Carus, who has doubtless inspired them all. The publishing house from which they emanate is prolific in this class of literature and often issues volumes of real merit. With the exception of Dr. Peck's volume, we do not consider that the recent issues add much to the needs of present day scholars. (The Open Court Co.)

E. K. M.

One of the latest volumes in the Foreign Religious Series is the *Resurrection of Jesus*, by Edward Riggenbach of the University of Basle. The author says truly that "there is scarcely another fact in the Christian faith which has caused so much difficulty to the belief of the modern man as the resurrection of Jesus." Dr. Riggenbach deals with the subject under four heads, treating first of the Sources of the Resurrection History, then of the Historically Demonstrable Fact, and then of the Explanations of the Historical Fact. He closes with the Meaning of the Resurrection of Jesus. This little volume is an exceedingly lucid presentation of the whole subject, well balanced and sane. We recommend it to all wishing a brief handling of the theme by an accurate historical scholar, who has gathered all the facts in the case and interprets them in the light of the history of the times. (Eaton & Main, pp. 74. 40 cts.)

E. K. M.

It is really a pity that in issuing three volumes of the writings of the late Professor Charles William Pearson, the publishers did not see to it that they were prefaced by a suitable biographical sketch. The author's activity in the fields of both literature and theology, and his

somewhat unusual experience in theological controversy gives to them an interest and an illumination which is necessary to understand and fairly evaluate them. One volume, *The Search After Truth*, contains theological papers, another, *Literary and Biographical Essays*, and a third, *The Threefold Cord*, consists of poems grouped under the heads of Religion, Literature, Humanity. The author has the gift of clear expression, and his essays on biographical subjects and on poetry are full of interesting information and discriminating judgment. The one on "Early American Poetry" is especially good. One feels in them that peculiar quality which was so characteristic of the lecturers of the Lyceum platforms of a generation ago, a certain level clarity which could instruct and at the same time entertain. The most noticeable quality in the theological essays is their evenness of temper and lack of passion, especially in view of some of the experiences of the author. They are the restrained, thoughtful, utterances of a man of letters. On the whole his power is rather in appreciation, than in critical or constructive work. (Sherman, French & Co. \$1.25 per vol., \$3.00 set.) A. L. G.

The professors of Auburn Theological Seminary have jointly published a volume under the title *What Shall I Believe*. It consists of nine addresses given in the Second Presbyterian Church, Auburn, N. Y., during 1907. Professor Dulles and Professor Riggs each gave two and the other professors one each. They do not, taken all together, present a system of theology but they are designed to treat in a way which shall be scholarly but popular, certain topics with respect to which questions are at the present time being asked. The general tone is, as would be expected, of the "moderate conservative" type of theology. They are moreover pervaded with an earnest desire to come close to the real needs of everyday men. They will be found of especial value in setting people right as to what earnest theologians of the past really believed, as contrasted with the somewhat weird caricatures of orthodox Christian doctrine which many modern writers sketch in as a background, to make their own thought appear both new and true. It is of course impossible to discuss them in detail, but it can be said in general that they will prove wholesome spiritual food. The successive addresses are Concerning Belief, God, Jesus Christ, The Bible, Man, Salvation, The Church, The Resurrection, The Future Life. (Presb. Board of Publ., pp. 220, \$1.00.)

A. L. G.

The Grammar of Philosophy. A Study in Scientific Method, is written by Mr. David Graham of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-law. The book shows considerable reading in literature and in philosophy and an intimate familiarity with the writings of Hamilton and of his predecessors of the Common Sense School which is somewhat unusual in current philosophical discussion. This is as it should be, for the author says that the work "is a development of what is commonly known as the Scottish Philosophy, and requires that we shall resolutely follow the guidance of Common Sense whithersoever it leads, and as resolutely refuse to go where it does not lead." This method leads the author into a rationalistic utilitarianism which both in the content of its thought and the form of

its expression would have been more congenial to the readers of a century ago than to those of the present time. The book lacks the rugged vigor of Reid, the subtilty of Hamilton, and the sympathetic breadth of McCosh. The majority of modern readers who wish to familiarize themselves with this way of looking at the problems of philosophy will get more profit from consulting the works of the masters. The tendency of the writer to an epithetical intolerance of temper does not help to induce that sense of philosophic calm supposed to be conducive to the best result in "a study of scientific method." (Imported by Scribner, pp. xii, 383, \$2.50.)

A. L. G.

In The Christian Method of Ethics by Henry W. Clark, appears a book that belongs in the same class as Pres. King's "The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life." It fixes the eye upon two realities: the simple, perfect life of Christ in far-off Palestine;—and the strenuous, complex life of his followers today. And it seeks to find how the two may reach real unison, how his simplicity may truly reign through all this complexity. The treatment is marked upon every page with unmixed earnestness and soberness. No effort anywhere appears after mere flourish. Indeed the pages run on in such unvarying monotone of sobriety as to be tedious. But for all that the author holds the reader's respect. He handles a grave task, and he keeps it steadily in hand. As a result the very monotony becomes steadying. The author holds staunchly by his faith in Christ. With this firm faith he faces the whole world bravely. He shows fine assurance that Christianity is supreme. And he shows the same assurance that Christianity is adequate to interpret and dominate our vastly varied modern life. He takes his stand upon the living conviction that the true present day Christianity is the life of God in man. This sublime and simple verity he turns about towards various lights with a beautiful honesty and carefulness. His openness and cautiousness and minute appreciation of his task contribute largely to the sterling value of the book. For conclusion his inclusive rule runs: "At each emergence of crisis, the Christian must call up the living presence of the living Christ, and submit himself to its spell." This rule he carefully defends from the easy criticism of vagueness and mysticism, declaring it adequate and inductively scientific.

The inwrought weakness of his thought, the same as appears in the thought of Pres. King, is his blind acceptance of Love as the simple total of ethics. Unable to voice all his thought in that one word, he employs "strength" as its complement, but only immediately, like all his ilk, to resolve his strength into love. But when that still is felt not to avail for voicing all his thought, he introduces "Right," though only as an abstraction, carefully separated from a "self." So it always goes. And still it is called "Ethics." But surely that is naught but jugglery. Why does he not grapple with Truth, and for that matter with Love, as an elemental radical in Ethics, and show just what it is! (Revell, pp. 254, \$1.25.)

C. S. B.

The varied demands upon the modern church are well reflected in the scope of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching. Dr. Brown has

recently spoken of the social demands, Dr. Forsythe on the Doctrinal Emphasis, and this last year President W. H. P. Faunce discusses *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry*. This latest volume falls below none of the others in dignity, timeliness and force. He recognizes the marked demand upon the preacher and pastor today for the teaching note, both as a public speaker and local organizer of the educational functions of the pastorate. This is not a book of methods, it has no distinctive chapter upon the Sunday School even—but he discusses more broadly the great principles which must underlie the motives of the pulpit and pastorate. He finely analyzes earlier and modern conceptions of the minister, to show just where his teaching function comes into the modern demands of the church and her ministry. Nowhere can one find a fuller and yet more succinct statement of the modern emphasis upon education. It is the educated pastor in biblical learning he has in mind in discussing the modern teaching uses of the Scripture. It is ethical leadership that he dwells upon, ethical education for pastors. He is not recounting vaguely the need of the church to espouse ethical programs, but he is bent upon having a force and fire in a rightly instructed moral leadership among a group of men who know how to make clear to the church, as his force, these pressing duties. His chapter on the Service of Psychology is compact with the best results of this aid to efficient teaching leadership. It is sane and discreet. He has some wise suggestions about the pastor as an "Educational Director" in his Sunday School, prayer meeting and preaching service. He holds the balance well between the inspirational and informing character of Bible study. He draws comparison between the college and church in their mutual relation in teaching; indicating how much more the college has changed its methods than the church; how yet the college naturally uses the analytic and the church the synthetic method; how growth in one, and crisis in the other, are the dominant ideals; and how each may get a suggestion and motive from the predominant emphasis of the other. The book closes with a fresh and illuminating discussion of "The Education of the Minister by His Task." This is a book of the most vital stimulus. It picks up theories old and new which, as mere pedagogics or psychology, are dry-as-dust, and puts them into rubrics of impulse and light. The author has read widely on his specific subject, but refuses to be bound by some of its pet predilections. He is intent upon bringing out of the chaff of the discussions some good sound wheat for the quickening of the church and her ministry on this needed part of a ministering function. The style of the book is bright, trenchant, at times startling in its untrammelled statements. It is a book to read *just now*, to correct and to inspire a manifest trend of our day. (Macmillan, pp. 286, \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

A Comfortable Faith, by Malcolm J. McLearn is surely one of the best volumes of sermons recently published from our own pulpit. It is a collection unified in the word "Comfort," but it is not a series on the solaces of religion, yet it carries the deeper sense of comfort, viz: strength—and it has to do with the strength which is inspired by faith, as a strong and stalwart thing. Nowhere is there in these sermons the merely

apologetic tone, nor a belligerent attitude of argument for the Christian gospel; but the preacher in a clear, positive fashion grips the central verities and presents them strongly, with intellectual force, and affluent illustration. This volume illustrates a type of strong preaching which we begin to find increasing within a few years; preaching, that is, which is beginning to get intellectual adjustment to modern conditions of thought, without throwing away the deep truths which alone can vitalize the pulpit. It is noticeable also, here and in other recent sermons, how the modern pulpit is making use of the more spiritual conceptions of the profounder science, and is using the interpretative values of general literature. The better sermons published in the last few years show that the greater preachers are beginning to get new, fresh and vital grasp of the great essentials of pulpit power. The assuring and constructive notes of this volume indicate the demand of thoughtful laymen for this mental grasp of the situation, and for clear, well illustrated and cogently presented data of the Christian life. The range of illustration is remarkable;—but there is little waste of this material in mere adornment or in the mere story-telling entertainment which furnishes conventional padding in place of thought. (Revell, pp. 191, \$1.00.)

A. R. M.

This volume on *The Gift of Influence* by Prof. Hugh Black is chiefly interesting, apart from its own intrinsic worth, as an illustration of effective college preaching. The author is *persona grata* with a large constituency of young men in our seats of learning. The book with one or two exceptions is made up of sermons preached in our own colleges. It is notable that they are not academic discussions, the preacher having discovered that students have a surfeit of the book side of life and truth in their ordinary studies; that college audiences are made up of men only beginning their education; and that their problems are the problems of youth. He realizes moreover that young men in college are not as yet much affected by the materialism of the day, but by what he calls "unregulated idealism." He finds that they give ready response to high and generous passions, if the preacher knows how to interpret them; and that practical ideals of social service meet the outgoing enthusiasm of youth. It is in response to this discovery regarding young men that the author keys his message. He aims to bring high ideals, chiefly ethical ideals. A possible criticism of the range of his topics, and the motive in his sermons, may be that he does not go more deeply into the hidden spiritual cravings of youth nor strike at the profounder religious sensations. This we may think such a master of assemblies might do, without being too theological or academic.

Another thing to note about the sermons acceptable to young men is their comparative brevity, and yet they are long enough and full enough in Dr. Black's skillful handling, to illumine without exhausting his theme. He has discovered the secret of knowing how to make all his sermons of uniform length. Every sermon in the book is just about ten pages long. It is notable again that Dr. Black is using the Old Testament with renewed frequency and force. Eighteen out of twenty-seven sermons grow out of an Old Testament text.

Again, his sermons are remarkably simple. A true simplicity is the finest fruit of preaching, if it do not result in thinness. There is nothing of this latter fault here. And yet his simplicity is not the result of condensation of superabundant thought into packed sentences. He gives himself plenty of elbow room; is never attempting to show how much he has packed into this sermon. He simplifies by picking the more weighty and practical aspect of his subject and letting other things go. He does not strive to finish a subject. He just simplifies a theme.

Another thing to notice is his ability to be clear without much formal structure. Nearly all his sermons consist of a luminous, graphic explanation of the text in its most interesting setting—and then a use of his principles educed in a few clear, sharp and earnest applications. Nothing could seem simpler, and yet there is the consummate art in the way he conceals art, of which Horace spoke.

Again the sermons are not signalized by any over-elaboration of illustrative material; enough of it, but not a particle of the kindergarten effort, or the story-telling mania, which some speakers to youth think it necessary to exemplify. These are peculiarly "straight sermons" as Dr. Van Dyke named one of his volumes. They have no superfluities; make no straining for effect, but go directly and quietly, yet firmly and earnestly, to the one end he would reach. (Revell, pp. 307, \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

Dr. Henry A. Stimson's volume of sermons is very welcome. Here is a preacher who is awake to *The New Things of God*, who yet both in spirit and in detail holds firmly to the great fundamental verities of the old. We feel in these sermons the tone of the pastor, who in close touch with human experiences has learned how deeply the great facts and forces of God flow in the human soul. We feel also the wide reading scholar, who has kept abreast of modern scholarship and literature, who gives both their spiritual evaluation, freely accepts new light and is yet not dazzled by it, and is ever intent to gather everywhere help upon the inner problems of life.

It is interesting to see that many of these "new things of God" the author finds in the prophets. Three at least of his best sermons are taken from Micah, Amos and Jonah. His interpretation of Jonah is especially interesting, using it as a "prophetic tale." This book, in common with much of the best modern preaching, exemplifies the wide range of subjects seen in our day of pulpit discussions. It illustrates, too, that the best evangelistic preaching today in its content is engaged in explaining and simplifying the meaning of Life, Faith, Getting Right with God, Enlightening the Heart, and other such vital words. We have seen few better balanced statements regarding "The Church and the Sick," called out by modern Psychotherapy. He shows the same sanity in his sermon on "Jesus Christ and Social Conditions."

These sermons show the tendency of the best modern preaching to return again to the clear outline of thought which a decade ago it was fashionable to obscure lest it seem dependable upon the reticulation of a former generation. Fortunate a parish which has a minister who blends the teaching impulse and the pastoral touch as the author of

these sermons evidently has, and who can bring out of his treasures things new and old. (Revell, pp. 280, \$1.25.) A. R. M.

Dr. Charles F. Aked is a new light in the American pulpit. He has already made for himself a large place in his New York pulpit. As he appears in his volume of sermons, *Old Events and Modern Meanings*, he differs in many ways from other English preachers who have come to this country. He is not of the distinctively English and Scotch school of biblical and textual expositors. He is more topical in his methods—in this respect more akin to the American pulpit. He does not bring to America the tonic of contrast and impulse in this respect that Dr. Hall or Dr. Taylor exemplified, but he is pre-eminently a live, present-day preacher, intent upon close, pungent insistence of application to the times and duties at hand. He shows more evident use of results of biblical criticism in his sermons than is often seen, though he says very little about the processes, either belligerently or apologetically. His style is terse and strong, though he has also the graces of utterance, as in his fine sermon on *The Gate called Beautiful*. He does not despise humor as an agent of lodging his truth. He is full of the best modern literature in his illustrations. He has a keen sense of things to be hit, and hit hard in our modern life, as shown especially in his four sermons on *The Idols of the Tribe*, *The Cave*, *The Market Place*, and *the Theatre*. He is unconventional, and is willing at times to shock the placidities of hearers. He is somewhat lacking in the deeper spiritual notes of the Christian life, but his rôle is an important one in other ranges, and we have in him a coadjutor of an individual type, original, earnest, practical—a man of force, who uses all the refinements of his evident culture, for making the homely close fitting garments of truth to be worn every day of the week. (Revell, pp. 251, \$1.25.) A. R. M.

Dr. David J. Burrell is known by his volumes of sermons and other contributions to religious thought. This book may or may not have been originally prepared as a collection of sermons—but is not published as such; the topics being introduced generally by a verse of poetry, and a legend indicating the intent of the discussion. For example, the topics are announced in this fashion: "The Ten O'clock Man: in which the ambitious youth is advised against the morning's drowse." "The Handicap: in which it is shown that one may go to college and not get a diploma." "Opportunity: in which there is a picture of ships off the bay." Here are twenty-two chapters treating of subjects designed for the young man whose lot is cast in the city, who has high aims, and yet may lose them. The author hopes that his book may "tighten a buckle of his harness and furnish his quiver with a sharp arrow or two." The captions of these words of counsel entitled *The Lure of the City* are just enough unconventional to catch the ear of a young man, without being sensational. The essay rather than the sermonic form is wisely taken for the same reason. The range of topics is timely and practical: e. g. *Going into Business*, *Choosing Friends*, *The Pace that Kills*, *The Code of Honor*, *The Quitter*, *The Fool*, *Dreams*, *Voices*, etc., etc. We are struck with the admirable way in which biblical story is woven into his illustrative

material in ways of surprising freshness. His range of biographical material is wide, and his stories are dignified. His advice is not stereotyped, and his thought is unhackneyed. There is a fine blend of the religious impulse and of homely every-day philosophy in these essays. It is one of the manliest, least mawkish, most invigorating books for young men we have seen. (Funk & Wagnalls, pp. 284, price \$1.00 net.)

A. R. M.

President William DeWitt Hyde has put forth a small book entitled *Abba Father*, which might be classified as a book of devotion, and yet the book is named by him a book of "sermon-prayers." They are based upon meditations of the author when "cut off from ordinary work, and attendance upon public worship." Composed in his travels, and written in retirement in Switzerland, he aims to put his thoughts into a form suggested by the reflection that "Real religion is the offering up by each man's life, in its concrete setting, day by day, hour by hour, moment by moment, to the guidance and keeping of God." To this end, he meditates upon themes of personal faith, in the form of communion with God. The prayer-sermons of this volume are cast in the form of address to God, somewhat in the vein of George Matheson. Some of the perplexities as well as the certitudes of faith are thus reflected. These prayer-sermons reflect to us the mind of the author in a different light from that we are familiar with in one who has been felt as the keen, *ad hominem* and sometimes combative prophet of his own thought. We welcome this new aspect of his personality, in which are shown his tender and devout dealing with the innermost habits of the mind and heart. They are not meant to be regarded as a collection of prayers—but yet they may be so used with profit by laymen and ministers to enrich the liturgy of private and public devotion. (Revell, pp. 71, 50 cts.)

A. R. M.

This volume entitled *A Junior Congregation*, by Rev. James M. Farrar consists of sermons preached to children in the regular morning service preceding the usual sermon to adults; brief sermons occupying about five minutes. As illustrations of such preaching, the book will be welcomed by those contemplating this type of preaching. The author gives samples for each Sunday of the year, using as far as possible the suggestions of the church year, or of the seasons, or in absence of such suggestions unifying the topics for a month of cognate themes. The sermons are very simple, abound in stories, and use the imagination. The book is preceded by an introduction explaining the formation of the Junior Congregation and advocating the value of such preaching. (Funk & Wagnalls, pp. 220, \$1.20 net.)

A. R. M.

This volume of essays by Dr. Wm. T. Herridge, entitled *The Coign of Vantage*, which are called Studies in Perspective as a sub-title, contains some forceful thoughts upon Keeping Abreast of the Times, The Human Touch, The Profit of Failure, The Complex Life, etc. They afford pleasant reading with serious and well balanced turns of thought. But neither the themes nor their discussion have any striking or peculiar freshness in thought or expression. The author shows considerable

familiarity with the best writers in his quotations; but quotation is too frequent, and seems to dominate the author's thought, rather than serve as instrument to his own. These papers are too sermonic to be first-class essays; and they lack the touch of humor, without which serious purpose and good thoughts suffer, when presented in the essay category. (Revell, pp. 160, \$1.00.)

A. R. M.

It is not always the largest books that have the most in them. Here is a booklet by John Edgar Park well worth careful perusal. *The Keen Joy of Living* has only thirty-two pages, but it contains thrice that measure of value. Under captions of Life as an Art, a Game, a Jest, a Fairy Tale, the author discusses in a vein of mingled seriousness and sparkle a wholesome philosophy of life. The art of producing a beautiful thing out of scanty resources; the Game of Life made interesting by its risks, its intellectual keenness, and its earnestness; the humor of life, its unfinish, its dissimilarities between ideal and achievement; its simple non-moral notes; its amenities and comforts and resting places; such is the brief epitome of a brief book which urges upon us certain factors in the religious life, which we may forget as vital accessories to serious purpose. (Pilgrim Press, pp. 32.)

A. R. M.

A brief work in paper covers by Dr. C. R. Brown on *The Gospel of Good Health* contains some tonic thoughts upon the topic so much discussed today. Recognizing the value of the new therapeutics of the mind, coupled with certain resources for serious illness, in medicine, the author indicates as both common sense and Christian, the value of right thoughts, high expectations, firm resolution and faith in God, in the matter of sound health and abounding vigor. As a well written and brilliant essay, full of practical wisdom and spiritual suggestion, it would serve as a useful tract for wide reading at the present juncture. (Pilgrim Press, pp. 32.)

The general acceptance of the concept of Evolution as co-ordinating in a remarkable way facts within the whole realm of thought and experience, has raised anew the question as to the nature of truth and as to the method of attaining to it. This appears from literature in many different fields. In the sphere of religion the question respecting truth has generally been linked with the question respecting authority. Are religious propositions true because they are authoritatively promulgated, or are they authoritatively promulgated because they are true? Such a query leads to the inquiry as to the source of religious tenets. Are they inspired or not, and if inspired, in what sense, and what is the ultimate relation between inspiration, truth and authority? Still further, in accord with the doctrine of evolution, how reconcile changing views as to what is true in the sphere of religion with a theory of inspiration as to the method of communicating religious truth? Mysticism and Dogmatic Rationalism (either positive or negative) agree that inspiration is the method of imparting religious truth. Mysticism, however, would hold that it is imparted through the feelings in an inchoate form inexpressible in precise verbal propositions. Dogmatic Rationalism would

hold, on the other hand, that it is communicated in the form of ultimate verbal propositions of changeless validity. Both extreme views encounter difficulties which seem fatal to the value of inspired religious truth. Mysticism makes it incommunicable, and consequently unrecognizable as truth. Dogmatic Rationalism makes it unrecognizable as truth because the changing thought of the ages is unable to accept the permanent validity of its formulated statements. The question thus comes to be shaped thus: How can there be a permanent inspired truth constantly changing in form, to be freely accepted by the individual under stress of no authority but that of its own self-evidencing verity? This is a question which comparative religion raises, which, within Christianity, recurs with respect to the historical treatment of the Bible, and which comes to the fore in the analysis of the various phases of the Christian consciousness.

This is substantially the question which confronted Prof. George L. Raymond, and led him to write *The Psychology of Inspiration*, "an attempt to distinguish religious from scientific truth and to harmonize Christianity with modern thought," and in which he tries to rationalize religion without being a rationalist. The book is divided in a general way into two sections, the first of which is concerned with an analysis of the nature of truth in general and the distinguishing of scientific from religious truth, and the second which traces the value and effects of his conclusions on various fields of the religious life. The conclusions of the book may be briefly, though necessarily inadequately, summarized in the following way. It is the peculiarity of religious truth that it is imparted by inspiration. It is not got by strictly scientific or logical processes. The method of its impartation is through suggestion. This is analogous to, though by no means identical with, hypnotic suggestion. It has this in common with hypnotic suggestion that it is in a considerable degree imparted to the subconscious self, and influences character and conviction through the subconscious and not by means of the direct appeal to the assent of the intellect. Such a conception "may render the statement of the truth less comprehensible and definite, but it need not render the truth itself less apprehensible and determinate. The indefinite expressions of the Scriptures which the creeds seek to render definite are just what are needed for the practical influence which Christianity is intended to have upon the minds and lives of men in general." Creeds are unwise as tests of whether or not one is or is not a Christian because of the excessively definite form of their statement which appeals for exact intellectual assent, and which must become inexact under changing conditions. In this way is explicable the mighty influence of great personalities, quite apart from the precise forms of speech they use, or a precise analysis of what it is in the personality which produces the effect. "Most Christians know what is meant by saying, that the Christ becomes the Saviour of man, not by doing more for him than he has already done, but by being more for him, by being recognized as such." As has been indicated by the foregoing, the author traces the effect of such a view on the interpretation of the Bible, on "Christian Dogmatism," on the Christian Church, both

as an organization and a means for common worship, upon Christian conscience and faith, upon the unity of religious belief and upon many of its relations to speculative thought. The book is well worth a discriminating and careful reading. It is stimulating to thought along a great many lines and is to be welcomed as an earnest attempt to answer many questions which the modern man must face. (Funk & Wagnalls, pp. xix, 335. \$1.40.)

A. L. G.

Happenings in the Seminary

THE APPROACHING ANNIVERSARY.

With the 75th year of the seminary's life nearly half gone all eyes turn toward the celebration of the diamond jubilee. One notable feature will be a commemorative volume for which most of the material is already in the hands of the editor, Professor Paton. It will contain contributions from seventy-five persons at some time connected with the institution as teachers or students. It will show the progress in numerous lines of scholarship and opinion and of practical Christian enterprise, during three quarters of a century; and also indicate the chosen studies and activities of a large number of Hartford men. So it will certainly appeal to the seminary's own constituency and be worthy too of a wider circle of readers. The public exercises of the anniversary will extend over four days. On Sunday, May 23d, the pulpits of Hartford and the towns near by will be generally opened to returning alumni for sermons on the Call to the Ministry. The day following will be given to the School of Religious Pedagogy. Secretary Cope of the Religious Education Association will be one of the speakers at an afternoon conference, and President King of Oberlin will make the address at the graduation exercises in the evening.

The program for Tuesday, May 25th, has been largely provided for by the Alumni Association. What Hartford men have done in several spheres will be narrated as follows: Hartford Alumni in Foreign Missions, by J. L. Barton; in Home Missions, by H. H. Kelsey; in Literature, by E. C. Richardson; in Education, by Williston Walker; in the Pulpit, by O. S. Davis. Professor W. S. Pratt gives the Historical Survey, his direct knowledge of the seminary life as a teacher covering a third of the period and more.

The evening banquet will be the natural occasion for fraternal and congratulatory greetings and forecasts. Similar institutions, the alumni and the larger public will be ably represented.

Wednesday, May 26th, will be the crowning day of the celebration. The graduation exercises will be put into the forenoon. President Woodrow Wilson has agreed to make the address at that time and President Mackenzie will follow with the charge to the class. A solid conference on "Theological Education and the Life of the Church" will find place in the afternoon. The public celebration in the evening will be a rich session. Rev. R. F. Horton of London will be heard with special interest; and the Seminary and the City, the Nation and the World will be the themes of Rev. R. H. Potter, Secretary H. C. Herring and President Capen of the American Board, respectively.

Social reunions will be a further attraction; and the largest home-gathering of alumni the seminary has ever known is confidently looked for.

A nearer event and one of great consequence too, is the sixth annual conference of eastern college students on the ministry. It will be held in Hosmer Hall, April 2-4. Such representative men as President John H. Finley, Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, Mr. Edward M. Shepherd, Prof. B. W. Bacon, Rev. Henry S. Coffin, Mr. Robert E. Speer, Secretary J. W. Cochrane, President W. D. Mackenzie, Rev. Harry E. Fosdick, Prof. P. M. Rhineland, Rev. S. Parkes Cadman and Bishop Brewster will speak.

The invitation includes prospective laymen as well as men looking towards the ministry. Three years ago more than a hundred students came to a similar conference. An even larger attendance and at least an equal interest in the prerequisites, ideals, problems and opportunities of the ministry are hoped for this time.

The seminary life so far this year has been very satisfactory. The student family has been large and harmonious, there have been signs of zest in the class-room work and the deeper spiritual interests have appeared to dominate all.

The renovated dining and social rooms have fostered the fraternal life of the men living in Hosmer Hall. On several Sunday afternoons at twilight, Mrs. Mackenzie has served tea, and such students as happened to have no regular appointments for Sunday work have enjoyed the home flavor of a friendly hour with a faculty family or two and with each other.

On the day of the November meeting of the Trustees, the Faculty met them at luncheon. This means of better acquaintance between the two executive boards of the seminary has been a feature in their relationship for the last two or three years, and much enjoyed on both sides. Besides the usual share in church and charitable work in Hartford and vicinity, the students have been put in touch with the outside world by a number of visiting speakers and by representation in some important conventions. Among visitors who have taken a helpful part in the chapel services, held now in the morning instead of at mid-day, may be mentioned Professors Gray of Mansfield College, Oxford and Nash of Pacific Theological Seminary, and Mrs. C. H. Daniels, President of the Woman's Board of Missions. At the Friday night meetings there have been addresses by Rev. R. H. Potter on the application of Corporation Principles to the Christian church, Mr. H. J. Gillette on the Personal Experience of a City Missionary, Miss Alice Adams on Some Aspects of Missionary Work in Okayama, Japan, Mr. Albert R. Williams, recently Thompson Fellow, on Social Opportunities of the Present-Day Church, and Rev. Owen Lovejoy, Secretary of the National Committee on Child Labor. The meetings of the latter organization and of the Woman's Board of Missions in Hartford during the Fall, interested a good number from the Seminary Circle. The institution was represented at the significant International Student Bible Conference at Columbus, Ohio, by Professor Bassett and Messrs. Walter and Twichell, and at the meeting of the

Connecticut Valley Missionary Conference at Smith College, by Mr. Rowlands. A majority of the student body and several members of the Faculty attended the annual meeting of the American Board in Brooklyn. Professor Gillett was on the program, speaking in enforcement of the appeal of the Home Department.

Professor Merriam's Field Day with the middlers for a view of the problems of rural churches, was very profitably spent at East Windsor. The occasion gave free contact with such discerning and effective men as pastors W. F. English, T. C. Richards, D. E. Jones and Arthur Goodenough, Secretary Ives and Superintendent McLean. Messrs. C. B. Bliss, S. A. Fiske and W. C. Prentiss from the younger Hartford Alumni added impulse to the occasion by their presence and participation in discussion. Since then Professor Merriam has shared in two conferences at Boston for launching the promising Country Church Association.

Faculty representatives of the seminary have appeared on public platforms and among the churches frequently of late. Among President Mackenzie's engagements have been the delivery of the Tappan Lecture at Ann Arbor, before a great university audience, gathered largely by the efforts of Professor French, a loyal Hartford man; and the sessions of the International Sunday School Lesson Committee. In December, Professor Paton took the road for the Archeological Institute of America, giving lectures on Palestine in the Light of the most Recent Discoveries before branches of the institute in Yale, Columbia and Princeton Universities and in Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Washington, Pa., and Rochester. Prof. Paton has also lately become American Secretary for the Palestine Exploration Fund. Professor Macdonald has spoken several times on Missions in Mohammedan Lands and Recent Political Events in the Turkish Empire. Professor Gillett has been called on for a number of addresses in furtherance of the Layman's Missionary Movement.

Preaching engagements have been frequently filled by Professors Mackenzie, Merriam, Geer and Bassett. Professors Jacobus and Nourse have been deeply engrossed with their last labors upon the Standard Bible Dictionary, to which Professors Mackenzie, Paton, Macdonald, Mitchell, Pratt and Thayer are also contributors.

Several of the faculty have been active in Hartford organizations and movements, President Mackenzie in particular having filled the rôle of Reverend Thomas Hooker in the celebration of the noble Hartford Bridge. This he did so felicitously both as to its light and grave aspects as to hold for the moment, at least, the place of Hartford's first citizen.

Among the Alumni

It is the sad duty of the RECORD to chronicle the death by his own hand of ROBERT C. DOUGHERTY, of the class of 1907, on Sunday morning, December 27, 1908, in his rooms at Buchanan, N. D., apparently under the stress of an emotional depression that finally became insanity. Mr. Dougherty had been settled at Buchanan as pastor for about a year, ministering also to the church at Prairie. He had greatly endeared himself to the people by his unselfish and earnest character, and his decided mental gifts seemed to mark him for leadership and power. The son of a minister, he grew up naturally into the determination to give his life to Christian service. His college course was taken at Washburn College, where he graduated in 1902. His theological course at Hartford was supplemented by additional study at Chicago Seminary. As a student, he was thorough, accurate and laborious. Though quiet in disposition and eminently serious at all times, he won both respect and affection by the evident sincerity and excellence of his personality. While at Hartford there were some signs that his health was not robust, and some tendencies were noted to morbid self-depreciation. Before his death, for about a month, he had labored under a cloud of gloom, which his friends had done their best to lighten and which he himself had sought to lift by recourse to medical aid. The final darkness must have shut down suddenly, for he had duly prepared himself for his Sunday duties and was about to set forth for the first of them. As he was unmarried and lived apart, the exact circumstances at the end are not known. On his table, however, was found a letter, dated several days before, in which he said that he feared that he might not be able to resist the impulse to self-destruction that sometimes presented itself. Surely it is most pathetic to consider the ending, at the early age of twenty-eight, of a life that seemed so full of gracious and useful promise. And the heartiest sympathy will go out to the bereaved father, mother, brother and sisters at the family home in Kansas City, Mo.

Recent events in the Alumni circle that call for special mention here consist altogether of transfers from one field to another. Thus EDWIN

A. HAZELTINE, '79, after seven years' service at Rushville, N. Y., goes to the church at Falls Village, Conn. GERHARDT A. WILSON, '92, who has thus far been in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, was installed on November 5th over the church at Swampscott, Mass., the sermon on that occasion being preached by Edwin H. Byington, '87. EUGENE B. TREFETHREN, '99, lately working at Ipswich and Wambay, S. D., has accepted a call to Revillo in the same state. EDWIN G. CROWDIS, '02, recently of Kennebunk, Me., becomes pastor at Cotuit, Mass. ROGER A. DUNLAP, '03, having spent five years in fruitful labor at Paterson, N. J., is about to take up service at Windsor Locks, Conn. JAMES G. PHILLIPS, '06, till now at Granby, Conn., was installed in November at Mittineague, Mass., the sermon being by Professor Nourse, '91, and other parts by three other Hartford alumni.

From the ranks of those who have been Graduate Students, we note that DAVID BREWER EDDY has been called to the important duty of serving in the home department of the American Board, that ARNOLD V. HUIZINGA is called to the church at Thompson, Conn., and that JAMES H. ROBERTS is at work with the church at West Suffield.

ALUMNI REGISTER.

Corrected to January 1, 1909.

[The year of graduation follows the name. In the case of those who did not complete their course at Hartford, the year of the class to which they belonged is given in parenthesis. Those not ordained to the ministry are marked with an asterisk*. When no denomination is mentioned, Congregational may generally be understood.]

HARRY A. G. ABBE 1900	Pastor,
ISO ABE 1894	Pastor, Tokyo, Japan
SOLOMON, T. ACHENBACH (1905)	Greensboro, Vt.
HAIG ADADOURIAN 1893	Pastor, East Orleans, Mass.
GEORGE D. ADAMS 1880	Rector (P. E.), Riverside, Ill.
HARRY C. ADAMS 1889	Pastor, Danvers Center, Mass.
MYRON W. ADAMS 1884	Treasurer, Atlanta Univ., Atlanta, Ga.
WILLIAM H. ADAMS 1906	Pastor,
JAMES B. ADKINS (1888)	Pastor, Oskaloosa, Iowa
SARKIS M. ALBARIAN 1907	Pastor, West Brownfield, Maine
FREDERICK H. ALLEN 1873	2191 Broadway, New York City
JOHN B. ALLEN 1843	
HENRY C. ALVORD 1879	Pastor, South Weymouth, Mass.
MARDIROS H. ANANIKIAN 1901	Asst. Librarian, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.
GEORGE W. ANDREWS 1882	Pastor, Dalton, Mass.
THOMAS L. ANGELL* (1866)	Professor, Bates Coll., Lewiston, Me.
LEON H. AUSTIN 1901	Pastor, Roslindale, Mass.
EUGENE E. AYRES (1892)	Pastor (Bapt.), Chester, Pa.
VAHAN S. BABASINIAN 1900	
GILBERT H. BACHELER 1897	Pastor, New Lebanon, N. Y.
ALVIN C. BACON 1907	Pastor, New Britain, Conn.
SAMUEL F. BACON 1850	2527 N. 33d St., Philadelphia, Pa.
WILLIAM A. BACON 1895	Pastor, Littleton, N. H.
HENRY L. BAILEY 1889	Pastor, Longmeadow, Mass.
ROBERT H. BALL 1889	Pastor, Fairhaven, Vt.
HENRY L. BALLOU 1895	Pastor, Chester, Vt.
WILLIAM J. BALLOU 1900	Pastor, Ludlow, Vt.
CLARENCE H. BARBER 1880	Pastor, Danielson, Conn.
HERBERT A. BARKER 1901	Pastor, Jamaica Plain, Mass., 9 Chestnut Square
STEPHEN G. BARNES 1892	Pastor, St. Johnsbury, Vt.
S. ALLEN BARRETT 1887	Pastor, Florence, Mass.
JOHN O. BARROWS (1863)	Pastor, Stonington, Conn.
JOHN BARSTOW (1887)	Pastor, Lee, Mass.
EDWARD N. BARTLETT (1869)	Amsterdam, N. Y.
LYMAN BARTLETT 1861	Springfield, Mass.

WILLIAM A. BARTLETT 1885

JAMES L. BARTON 1885

ROBERT J. BARTON (1887)

G. SUMNER BASKERVILL 1882

AUSTIN B. BASSETT (1887)

HARRY A. BEADLE 1898

WILLIAM A. BEARD 1894

CLARK S. BEARDSLEE 1879

RAYMOND A. BEARDSLEE 1908

FLORENCE E. BELL* 1904

THOMAS J. BELL 1894

JULIA M. BENTLEY (1908)

IRVING H. BERG 1904

WILLIAM V. BERG 1908

THOMAS L. BICKEL (1898)

JOHN M. BIELER 1901

ALFRED H. BIRCH 1900

THOMAS D. BISCOE* (1866)

EDWIN W. BISHOP 1897

HARRY G. BISSELL 1892

OSCAR BISSELL 1853

WILLIAM F. BISSELL 1902

WALTER R. BLACKMER 1900

ARTHUR W. BLAIR (1876)

JAMES A. BLAISDELL 1892

GEORGE H. BLAKE 1863

CHARLES B. BLISS 1903

J. HENRY BLISS 1869

WILLIAM D. P. BLISS 1882

JOHN R. BOARDMAN 1898

JOSEPH C. BODWELL 1871

WILLIAM W. BOLT 1898

E. A. BOLT (1907)

ALBERT BOOTH (1855)

HAROLD G. BOOTH 1904

HOMER W. BRAINARD (1892)

CHARLES A. BRAND 1898

FRANK S. BREWER 1894

HOWARD A. BRIDGMAN (1887)

FRANK L. BRISTOL (1875)

ALICE S. BROWNE 1903

THERON BROWN (1859)

Pastor, Chicago, Ill., 564 Washington Boulevard

Secretary, A. B. C. F. M., Boston, Mass. 14 Beacon St.

Greensboro, Vt.

Teacher, Farm School, N. C.

Secretary, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.

Pastor, Franklin, Conn.

Missionary, Foochow, China

Professor, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.

Graduate Student, H. T. S.

Mrs. Gilbert Lovell (Missionary Pres.) Siangtau, Hunan, China

New York City

Missionary, Albany, Jamaica

Pastor (D. Ref.), Catskill, N. Y.

Pastor, Brandon, Vt.

Pastor (Ger. Ref.), Philadelphia, Pa., 733 N. 41st St.

Pastor, Machias, Me.

Amsterdam, N. Y.

Professor, Marietta Coll., Marietta, O.

Pastor, Oak Park, Ill.

Missionary, Ahmednagar, India

Brimfield, Conn.

Brimfield, Conn.

Pastor, Twinsburg, O.

Physician, 138 Norfolk St., Dorchester, Mass.

Professor, Beloit Coll., Beloit, Wis.

Manufacturer, Portland, Me.

Pastor, Hampden, Mass.

Pastor, Webster, N. H.

Rector (P. E.), Amityville, N. Y.

Secretary, Y. M. C. A., N. Y. City

Pastor, Machiasport, Me

Pastor, Lawrence, Kansas

Bridgeport, Conn.

Teacher, High Sch., Hartford, Conn.

Editor, C. S. S. & Pub. Soc., Boston, Mass., 14 Beacon St.

Pastor, Palmer, Mass.

Editor, *Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.

Pastor, Riverside, R. I.

Missionary, Tungcho, China

Editor, *Youth's Companion*, Boston, Mass.

- FRED M. BUKER (1906)
 HENRY F. BURDON 1907
 IRVING A. BURNAP 1892
 EDWARD A. BURNHAM 1900
 NORMAND H. BURNHAM (1877)
 HANFORD M. BURR 1888
 GRACE BURROUGHS* 1899
- REGINALD V. BURY (1893)
 JESSE BUSWELL 1898
 STEPHEN G. BUTCHER (1898)
 EDWARD P. BUTLER 1873
 FRANK E. BUTLER 1887
 CLAUDE E. BUTTERFIELD 1904
 EDWIN H. BYINGTON (1887)
 DONALD P. CAMERON 1898
 HOLLIS A. CAMPBELL 1886
 EDWARD W. CAPEN 1898
 HERBERT E. CARLETON 1894
 ISRAEL CARLETON 1863
 AUGUSTUS S. CARRIER 1884
- CLARK CARTER 1867
 HERBERT E. B. CASE 1904
 EMMA R. CHAPIN 1906
 FRANKLIN M. CHAPIN 1880
 EDWARD A. CHASE 1883
 SAMUEL A. CHASE 1899
 IRVING H. CHILDS 1903
 MAY P. CHRISTIE 1908
- ABEL S. CLARK* 1870
- ALBERT W. CLARK 1868
 CLARA M. CLARK* (1901)
 DANIEL J. CLARK 1880
 DANIEL W. CLARK (1882)
 GIDEON C. CLARK 1847
 HOLLIS S. CLARK (1862)
 JAMES S. CLARK 1904
 WILLIAM P. CLARKE 1891
 WILLIS M. CLEVELAND 1891
 ARTHUR CLEMENTS 1905
 WALLACE I. COBURN (1885)
 WILLIAM B. COLBURN (1853)
 Z. WESLEY COMMERFORD (1900)
 ONSLOW W. COMSTOCK* (1902)
 HARRY E. COOMBS 1903
 PHILIP D. COREY* 1869
- Pastor (M. E.), No. Sterling, Conn.
 Pastor, Ludlow, Mass.
 Pastor, Broad Brook, Conn.
 Pastor, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Rector (P. E.), Thompsonville, Conn.
 Teacher, Springfield, Mass.
 (Mrs. Wm. A. Mather), Missionary
 (Pres.), Pekin, China
- Pastor, Mantorville, Minn.
 Straight Univ., New Orleans, La.
 Crescent City, Fla.
 Pastor, South Hadley Falls, Mass.
 Pastor, Foxboro, Mass.
 Pastor, Beverly, Mass.
 Business, 71 Broadway, N. Y. City
 Pastor, East Hardwick, Vt.
 Jamaica Plain, Mass.
- Lebanon, Oregon
 Professor, McCormack Theol. Semi-
 nary, Chicago, Ill.
 Andover, Mass.
 Missionary, Aguana, Guam
 Lowell, Mass. Y. W. C. A.
 Missionary, Lin-Ching, China
 Pastor, Wollaston, Mass.
 Business, Wheaton, Ill.
 Deerfield, Mass.
 (Mrs. D. Miner Rogers), Hadjin,
 Turkey
 Teacher, School for the Deaf, Hart-
 ford, Conn.
 Missionary, Prague, Austria
 321 W. 45th St., New York City
 Pastor, East Haven, Conn.
 Ashland, Mass.
 Robbins, Tenn.
- Missionary, Monastir, Macedonia
- Pastor, Spencerport, N. Y.
 Pastor, Paola, Kansas
- Pastor, Prineville, Oregon
 7 Lynn St., Chelsea, Mass.
 Pastor, Troy, N. Y., R. F. D., No. 3.

- L. REBECCA CORWIN* 1893
 LYNDON S. CRAWFORD 1879
 EDWIN G. CROWDIS 1902
 GEORGE H. CUMMINGS 1886
 ALBERT M. CURRY* (1875)

 CHARLES H. CURTIS 1886
 ETHAM CURTIS (1868)
 GEORGE CURTISS (1863)
 PAYTON L. CURTISS 1900
 WILLIAM CRAWFORD (1908)
 ETHEL CUTLER 1907

 PIERRE S. DAGNAULT 1863
 WILLIAM N. P. DAILEY 1887
 MALCOLM DANA 1901
 LLEWELLYN J. DAVIES 1892
 CHARLES H. DAVIS 1901
 J. MERLE DAVIS 1904

 OZORA S. DAVIS 1894
 MARIN D. DELCHOFF (1887)
 VERNON H. DEMING 1898
 CHRISTAKES A. DEREBY (1886)

 JULES A. DEROME 1888
 ALPHONSE DE SALVIO* (1902)

 FRANK DIEHL (1903)
 SAMUEL W. DIKE (1866)
 S. K. DIMOCK 1850
 GEORGE S. DODGE 1872
 ROWLAND B. DODGE 1905
 ANTON S. DONAT 1908
 CHARLES A. DOWNS 1900
 ROGER A. DUNLAP 1903
 HARRY S. DUNNING 1896
 MORTON D. DUNNING 1899
 CHARLES H. DUTTON (1891)
 ALMON J. DYER 1886
 EDWARD O. DYER (1881)
 CHARLES O. EAMES 1897
 HENRY K. EDSON (1853)
 RICHARD S. M. EMRICH 1904
 WILLIAM F. ENGLISH 1885
 AUGUST C. ERNST 1906
 WILLIAM A. ESTERBROOK 1893
 PAUL D. FAIRCHILD* 1900
 ALLAN C. FERRIN 1896

 2345 55th St. S., E. Cleveland, O.
 %A. B. C. F. M., Boston, Mass.
 Pastor, Cotuit, Mass.
 Pastor, West Boylston, Mass.
 Physician, 493 Classon Ave., Brook-
 lyn, N. Y.
 Pastor, People's Ch., St. Paul, Minn.
 121 Morgan St., Buffalo, N. Y.
 Kent, Conn.
 Pastor, S. Milwaukee, Wis.

 Y. W. C. A., 125 E. 27th St. New
 York City

 Pastor (D. Ref.), Amsterdam, N. Y.

 Missionary (Pres.), Tsing-tau, China
 Pastor, Hollis, N. H.
 Secretary, Y. M. C. A., Nagasaki,
 Japan
 Pastor, New Britain, Conn.

 Pastor, North Wilbraham, Mass.
 Physician, 1128 West Montrose Ave.,
 Chicago, Ill.
 Pastor, Valley Springs, S. D.
 Professor, Northwestern University,
 Evanston, Ill.
 Oceanic, N. J.
 Auburndale, Mass.

 Pastor, Boylston Center, Mass.
 Pastor, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.
 711 Loomis Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Pastor, Hudson, N. H.
 Pastor, Windsor Locks, Conn.
 Pastor, Fort Jefferson, N. Y.
 Professor, Doshisha, Kyoto, Japan.
 Pastor, Watertown, N. Y.
 Pastor, Sharon, Mass.
 Pastor, Chester, Conn.
 Pastor, Athol, Mass.
 Professor, Iowa Coll., Grinnell, Ia.
 Missionary, Mardin, Turkey
 Pastor, East Windsor, Conn.
 Pastor, Hamilton Sta., Baltimore, Md.
 Pastor, Middlefield, Mass.

 Pastor, Lowell, Mass.

AARON W. FIELD 1870
CHARLES R. FISHER 1902
HERMAN P. FISHER 1883
G. WALTER FISKE 1898

SAMUEL A. FISKE 1900
EDWARD T. FLEMING (1891)
GEORGE C. FLETT (1899)
SAMUEL B. FORBES 1857
ANNIE J. FOREHAND* 1895

GILBERT L. FORTE 1905
EVERETT D. FRANCIS 1895
MILTON N. FRANTZ 1896
JAMES LESLIE FRENCH 1902
MONTIE J. B. FULLER 1902
ALBERT C. FULTON 1900
ROBERT N. FULTON 1903
WILLIAM F. FURMAN 1883
CLARENCE R. GALE 1885
TYLER E. GALE 1903
HOWARD S. GALT 1899
JAMES L. GAMBLE (1874)
JOHN GARABEDIAN (1889)
AUSTIN GARDNER 1860
HAROLD I. GARDNER 1907
WILLIAM GARDNER (1887)
JOHN P. GARFIELD 1902
EDWARD D. GAYLORD 1902
J. HOWARD GAYLORD 1899
CURTIS M. GEER 1890
WILLIS L. GELSTON 1905
WILLIAM A. GEORGE 1887
ARTHUR L. GILLET 1883
EDWIN C. GILLETTE 1897
HANNAH J. GILSON 1893
DWIGHT GODDARD 1894

LOUIS A. GODDARD 1901
L. W. GOEBEL (1907)
ARTHUR L. GOLDER 1891
JOHN H. GOODELL 1874
GILES F. GOODENOUGH 1896
FRED F. GOODSSELL 1905
EDWIN S. GOULD 1872
FREDERICK H. GRAEGER 1903
MERTIE L. GRAHAM* 1896

F. K. GRAVES (1877)

Gilsum, N. H.
Secretary, San Francisco, Cal.
Pastor, Crookston, Minn.
Professor, Oberlin Theol. Sem.,
Oberlin, O.
Pastor, Berlin, Conn.

Pastor, Gladstone, Mich.
Pelham, N. Y.
Teacher, 52 Berkeley St., Boston,
Mass.

Pastor, Sharon, Conn.
Springfield, Mass.
Pastor, Lisbon, N. Y.
Pastor (Pres.), Ann Arbor, Mich.
Pastor, Plainfield, Mass.
Pastor, Somersworth, N. H.
Pastor, Indianapolis, Ind.
Pastor (Unit.), Wilton, N. H.
Superintendent, Seattle, Wash.
Pastor, Greenville, N. H.
Missionary, Tung-cho, China

Pastor, Osceola, N. Y.
Pastor, Willington, Conn.
Pastor, Harvey, N. D.
Pastor, DeWitt, Iowa
Pastor, East Cleveland, O.
Pastor, Syracuse, N. Y.
Pastor, Saratoga, N. Y.
Professor, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.
Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
Pastor (Pres.), Hobart, N. Y.
Professor, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.
Pastor, Canaan, Conn.
Missionary, Melsetter, East Africa
8304 Linwood Ave., N., East Cleve-
land, O.
Pastor, Baraboo, Wis.

Pastor, Pacific Grove, Cal.
Northfield, Conn.
Missionary, Aintab, Turkey
Providence; R. I.
Pastor (Ger. Ev.), Chillicothe, O.
(Mrs. E. O. Grover), Highland
Park, Ill.

- CHARLES S. GRAY 1904
 ELIJAH W. GREENE 1885
 FREDERICK W. GREENE 1885
 FRANK J. GRIMES 1874
 EDWARD O. GRISBROOK 1904
 CHARLES T. HALL (1906)
 GEORGE A. HALL 1885
 JAMES E. HALL 1866
 WILLIAM R. HALL 1908
 RANSOM B. HALL 1898
 LEAVITT H. HALLOCK 1866
 BENJAMIN F. HAMILTON (1864)
 CHARLES W. HANNA (1878)
 EDWIN N. HARDY 1890
 MILLARD F. HARDY 1878
 WILLIAM P. HARDY (1890)
 ELIJAH HARMON 1867
 CHARLES S. HARTWELL* (1881)
 JASPER P. HARVEY 1880
 EZRA HASKELL 1859
 DAVID P. HATCH 1886
 GEORGE B. HATCH (1885)
 ALBERT S. HAWKES 1900
 GEORGE B. HAWKES 1902
 WINFIELD S. HAWKES 1868
 HENRY K. HAWLEY (1901)
 JOHN A. HAWLEY 1898
 EDWARD A. HAZELTINE 1879
 AUSTIN HAZEN 1893
 AZEL W. HAZEN (1868)
 CARLETON HAZEN 1891
 FRANK W. HAZEN 1897
 WILLIAM HAZEN 1897
 I. H. B. HEADLEY (1878)
 PHINEAS C. HEADLEY, JR.* (1886)
 JOHN J. HEEREN (1908)
 WILLIAM M. HEISLER (1908)
 SAMUEL S. HEGHIN 1898
 ROBERT P. HERRICK 1883
 GEORGE R. HEWITT 1886
 LEWIS W. HICKS 1874
 FRED B. HILL 1903
 L. POTTER HITCHCOCK 1892
 JOHN H. HOBBS 1885
 JOSEPH M. HOBBS 1886
 THOMAS M. HODGDON 1888
 LEWIS HODOUS 1900
 Pastor (Meth.), New Haven, Conn.
 Pastor, Unadilla, N. Y.
 Pastor, Middletown, Conn.
 South Hadley, Mass.
 Pastor, New Hartford, Conn.
 Brookline, Mass.
 Rector (P. E.), Granville, N. Y.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Pastor, Prairie City, Ia.
 Pastor, Lewiston, Me.
 Roxbury, Mass.
 Pastor, East Canaan, Conn.
 Pastor, Quincy, Mass.
 Pastor, E. Jaffrey, N. H.
 Pastor, Redondo, Cal.
 South Braintree, Mass.
 Principal, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Pastor, Chester, Mass.
 Pastor, Franklin, N. H.
 Pastor, Ware, Mass.
 Wilson, Conn.
 Pastor, McCook, Neb.
 Caldwell, Ida.
 Pastor, Fort Atkinson, Wis.
 Pastor, Shelburne Falls, Mass.
 Pastor, Falls Village, Conn.
 Pastor, Thomaston, Conn.
 Pastor, Middletown, Conn.
 Pastor, Portland, Conn.
 Pastor, Falmouth, Mass.
 Missionary, Sholapur, India
 Chaplain, U. S. A.
 Business, New Bedford, Mass.
 Pastor (M. E.), Ellicottville, N. Y.
 Pastor, Gann Valley, S. D.
 Superintendent, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Pastor, West Medway, Mass.
 Wellesley, Mass.
 Professor, Carleton Coll., Northfield, Minn.
 Pastor, Alameda, Cal.
 Pastor (Pres.), Jamaica, N. Y.
 Rector (P. E.), Providence, R. I.
 Pastor, West Hartford, Conn.
 Missionary, Foochow, China

- MARTIN C. HOEFER 1907
 PASTOR, MATTOON, ILL.
- FREDERICK A. HOLDEN 1883
 PASTOR, HUNTINGTON, CONN.
- ABRAM J. HOLLAND (1903)
 CURATE (P. E.), PARKVILLE, CONN.
- FREDERIC M. HOLLISTER 1891
 PASTOR, CROMWELL, CONN.
- ALICE M. HOLMES* 1899
 EASTPORT, ME.
- HENRY HOLMES 1892
 PASTOR, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
- JAMES E. HOLMES
- CHARLES H. HOSFORD* (1889)
- WILLIAM H. HOTZE (1901)
 PASTOR, CHEROKEE, IA.
- ANSON B. HOWARD (1899)
 PASTOR (FR. BAP.), SOUTH DANVILLE,
 N. H.
- JOHN HOWLAND 1882
 MISSIONARY, GUADALAJARA, MEXICO
- DAVID B. HUBBARD 1872
 PASTOR, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.
- GEORGE H. HUBBARD 1884
 PASTOR, HAVERHILL, MASS.
- PETER J. HUDSON 1890
 TUSKAHOMA, I. T.
- ELIZABETH N. HUME 1903
 (MRS. B. K. HUNSBERGER), MISSION-
 ARY, BYCULLA, INDIA
- BYRON K. HUNSBERGER 1903
 MISSIONARY, BYCULLA, INDIA
- A. BURTIS HUNTER (1879)
 PRINCIPAL, ST. AUGUSTINE'S SCH. (P.
 E.) RALEIGH, N. C.
- JAMES HUNTER (1891)
 GOLDEN GATE, CAL.
- PLEASANT HUNTER 1883
 PASTOR (PRES.), NEWARK, N. J.
- GEORGE H. HUNTINGTON 1907
 ROBERT COLL., CONSTANTINOPLE, TURKEY
- ALVA A. HURD (1870)
 PASTOR, PRESTON, IDA.
- JOHN E. HURLBUT 1874
 PASTOR, WAPPING, CONN.
- WALTER P. HUTCHINSON (1892)
- HERBERT C. IDE 1901
 PASTOR, MT. VERNON, N. Y.
- GEORGE L. IMES 1907
 NASHVILLE, TENN.
- THEODOR IRION 1901
 PASTOR (GER. EV.), OSHKOSH, WIS.
- FRANK E. JENKINS 1881
 PASTOR, ATLANTA, GA.
- HERBERT K. JOB 1891
 KENT, CONN.
- PHILIP A. JOB 1903
 PASTOR, CARLISLE, MASS.
- ELMER E. E. S. JOHNSON 1902
 EAST GREENVILLE, PA.
- GEORGE E. JOHNSON* (1895)
 413 BIJOU BLDG., PENN AVE., PHILA-
 DELPHIA, PA.
- JOHN Q. A. JOHNSON 1893
 PASTOR, NORWOOD, N. Y.
- LOUIS H. JOHNSTON (1906)
 WEST WOODSTOCK, CONN.
- CLINTON M. JONES 1865
 SANTURCE, PORTO RICO
- NEWTON I. JONES (1881)
 PASTOR (FREE BAP.), PITTSFIELD, ME.
- ELWYN K. JORDAN 1907
 MISSIONARY, BOMBAY, INDIA
- SHAMANTRAO V. KARMARKER (1892)
 PASTOR, PIGEON COVE, MASS.
- EDWARD P. KELLY 1896
- JOSEPH A. KELLOGG (1869)
 PASTOR, HARTFORD, CONN.
- HENRY H. KELSEY 1879
 BUSINESS, CHICAGO, ILL.
- HENRY S. KELSEY (1859)
 ALLSTON, MASS.
- WILLIAM S. KELSEY 1883
 SUFFIELD, CONN.
- DANIEL R. KENNEDY, JR. 1905
 MISSIONARY (PRES.), NING-PO, CHINA
- ASHER R. KEPLER 1901
 POST GRADUATE, H. T. S.
- SARKIS O. KERIAN 1908

- JOSIAH KIDDER (1880)
 CHARLES W. KILBON 1873
 GEORGE L. W. KILBON (1904)
 JOHN L. KILBON, JR. 1889
 HINES E. KING 1901
 HENRY KINGMAN 1887
 THOMAS C. KINNE 1872
 GEORGE E. KINNEY (1897)
 EZRA C. KNAPP (1907)
 GEORGE P. KNAPP 1890
 EDWARD H. KNIGHT 1880

 FRED T. KNIGHT 1895
 F. H. KNOLLIN 1906
 PAUL L. LACOUR (1894)
 GEORGE C. LAMBERT 1906
 ARCHIBALD A. LANCASTER 1908
 CALVIN LANE (1893)
 CHARLES S. LANE 1884
 ERNEST R. LATHAM 1892
 / FERDINAND R. LATHE* (1875)
 EDWARD A. LATHROP 1895
 FLOYD S. LEACH (1906)

 ASHLEY D. LEAVITT 1903
 EDITH W. LEAVITT* 1900

 GEORGE W. LEAVITT (1904)
 ALBERT LEE (1872)
 GEORGE H. LEE 1884
 GRAHAM LEE (1892)

 ANTHONY J. LEWIS (1908)
 CLARENCE A. LINCOLN 1905
 WILLIAM E. LINCOLN 1866
 WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH (1899)

 STEPHEN T. LIVINGSTON 1891
 WILLIAM F. LIVINGSTON 1887
 ADDIE I. LOCKE* 1895

 FRANK A. LOMBARD 1899
 CHARLES H. LONGFELLOW 1890
 ALBA L. P. LOOMIS (1863)
 CHARLES N. LOVELL (1904)
 GILBERT LOVELL 1903

 ROMULUS C. LOVERIDGE (1880)
 ADDISON F. LYMAN (1888)
- Pastor, Westford, Vt.
 Missionary, Amanzimtote, Natal
 Pastor, Ashton, S. D.
 Pastor, Springfield, Mass.
 Pastor, Candor, N. C.
 Pastor, Claremont, Cal.
 Montague, Mass.
 Pastor, Lee, N. H.
 81 Ashland Boul., Chicago, Ill.
 Missionary, Harpoot, Turkey
 Dean, Sch. of Rel. Pedagogy, Hart-
 ford, Conn.
 Pastor, Scituate Centre, Mass.
 Pastor, Kemptville, N. S.
 Pastor, Jonesboro, Tenn.

 Pastor, Corunna, Mich.

 Pastor (Pres.), Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
 Pastor, McPherson, Kansas

 Pastor, Tryon, N. C.
 Riverside Hospital, No. Brother
 Island, N. Y.
 Pastor, Concord, N. H.
 (Mrs. John M. Trout), Dobbs
 Ferry, N. Y.
 Y. M. C. A., Japan

 Pastor (Pres.), Batavia, O.
 Missionary (Pres.), Pyeng Yang,
 Korea

 Assistant Pastor, St. Louis, Mo.
 Painesville, O.
 Professor, Univ. of Pa., Philadel-
 phia, Pa.
 Pastor, Bridgton, Me.
 Rector (P. E.), Augusta, Me.
 Professor, Wellesley Coll., Wellesley,
 Mass.
 Dean, Doshisha, Kyoto, Japan
 Pasadena, Cal.
 Randolph, Wis.
 Pastor, Manchester, Conn.
 Missionary (Pres.), Siangtau, Hu-
 nan, China

FREDERICK B. LYMAN 1900
 HENRY M. LYMAN (1888)
 JAMES A. LYTLE 1899
 P. J. MACINNES (1907)
 JAMES L. MACMILLAN (1908)
 CHARLES A. MACK 1884
 HERBERT MACY 1883
 CHARLES MAEHL* (1875)
 F. BARROWS MAKEPEACE 1873
 CHARLES L. MANN* (1881)
 AUGUSTINE P. MANWELL 1900
 JOHN W. MARCUSSON 1854
 BURTON E. MARSH 1901
 JOHN L. MARSHALL, JR. (1900)
 JOHN MARSLAND 1876
 HENRY B. MASON 1892
 WILLIAM A. MATHER 1899
 BURLEIGH V. MATHEWS 1908
 S. SHERBURNE MATHEWS (1871)
 TAMEJIRO MATSUMOTO (1907)
 LAZARUS K. MAVROMATES 1902
 CHARLES H. MAXWELL 1903
 SAMUEL R. MCCARTHY (1905)
 GEORGE M. MCCLELLAN 1891
 WILLIAM D. MCFARLAND 1878
 MARTIN H. MEAD 1878
 WILLIS W. MEAD 1884
 OLIVER W. MEANS 1887
 ROYLA L. MELENDY (1905)
 EDWARD T. MERRELL (1889)
 CHARLES W. MERRIAM (1901)
 FRANK N. MERRIAM 1891
 JOHN E. MERRILL 1896
 THEODOR J. MERTEN 1902
 HOWARD C. MESERVE 1902
 I. CURTIS MESERVE 1869
 WILLIAM N. MESERVE 1874
 FRANK B. MEYER (1901)
 WILLIAM S. MIDDLEMASS 1906
 CATHARINE A. MILLER* 1900
 GEORGE A. MILLER 1859
 ROBERT D. MILLER 1852
 CHARLES D. MILLIKEN (1892)
 CHARLES S. MILLS (1885)
 FRANK V. MILLS 1882
 HERBERT L. MILLS 1903
 EDWARD A. MIRICK (1867)
 JOHN J. MOMENT 1906

Pastor, Fair Haven, Mass.
 Pastor, Covert, Mich.
 Pastor, North Middleboro, Mass.
 Park Hill, N. H.

Pastor, Oberon, N. D.
 Pastor, Newington, Conn.

Pastor, Granby, Conn.
 Physician,
 Pastor, Canton, Mass.
 Pastor (Pres.), LaGrange, Ill.
 Pastor, Farragut, Ia.

84 McDonough St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Pastor, Harvard, Mass.
 Missionary, Amer. Presb. Mission,
 Paotingfu, China
 % A. B. C. F. M., Boston, Mass.
 Roxbury, Mass.
 Tottori, Japan
 Chicago, Ill.
 Missionary, Adams, Durban, Natal
 Pastor, Spearfish, S. D.

6834 Frankstown Ave., Pittsburg, Pa.
 Nampa, Ida.
 Pastor (Pres.), Tompkinsville, N. Y.
 Pastor, Springfield, Mass.
 Cincinnati, O.
 Editor, *Advance*, Chicago, Ill.
 Pastor, Greenfield, Mass.
 Pastor, Newburyport, Mass.
 Missionary, Aintab, Turkey
 Pastor (Ger. Ev.), Bolivar, O.
 Pastor, Milford, Conn.
 Pastor, San Francisco, Cal.

Cleveland, O.
 Pastor, Kennedy, Sash. Canada

Syracuse, N. Y.
 Malden, Mass.
 Pastor, Waimea, Haw. Is.
 Pastor, St. Louis, Mo.
 Business, Hartford, Conn.
 Omaha, Neb.
 Pastor, Wahpeton, N. D.
 Jersey City, N. J.

CLEOPHAS MONJEAU (1867)

JOHN MONTGOMERY 1884

CALVIN B. MOODY 1880

PAUL B. MOODY (1907)

LEWIS F. MORRIS (1869)

GEORGE M. MORRISON 1890

CHARLES H. MORSE 1884

JOSEPH F. MORSE (1889)

LILLA F. MORSE 1902

MORRIS W. MORSE 1890

ELLIOTT J. MOSES 1906

VINCENT MOSES 1871

CHARLES S. NASH 1883

ARTHUR F. NEWELL (1893)

GEORGE B. NEUMANN 1908

SAMUEL A. NOON 1905

STEPHEN A. NORTON (1881)

EDWARD E. NOURSE 1891

JOHN K. NUTTING (1856)

WALLACE NUTTING (1889)

JAMES E. ODLIN 1884

AUGUSTINE D. OHOL* (1906)

CHARLES B. OLDS 1899

JAMES A. OTIS 1895

HENRY A. OTTMAN 1869

GEORGE W. OWEN 1903

JULIA F. OWEN* 1902

HERBERT L. PACKARD (1902)

JOHN H. PALMER (1907)

WILLIAM H. PARENT (1891)

HUBERT E. PARKER 1900

BENJAMIN PARSONS 1854

HENRY M. PARSONS 1854

MARTIN K. PASCO (1869)

H. PHILIP PATEY* (1901)

ARTHUR H. PEARSON (1880)

CHARLES PEASE (1896)

EDWARD C. PERKINS* (1903)

HENRY M. PERKINS 1872

HENRY P. PERKINS (1882)

JOHN R. PERKINS* (1896)

J. NEWTON PERRIN, JR. 1891

ALFRED T. PERRY 1885

LAURENCE PERRY (1891)

T. C. PERRY 1851

CHARLES H. PETTIBONE 1882

Business, Middletown, O.

Pastor (Pres.), English Town, N. S.

Pastor, Bristol, Conn.

Instructor, East Northfield, Mass.

Rector (P. E.), Bethany, Conn.

1609 Kirkwood Ave., Pasadena, Cal.

St. Johnsbury, Vt.

Instructor, Mt. Holyoke Coll., South
Hadley, Mass.

Pastor, Wilbur, Wash.

Tufts College, Mass.

Ossipee Center, N. H.

Prof., Pac. Theol. Sem. Berkeley, Cal.

Pastor, Franklin, Neb.

Missionary (M. E.), Chentu, China
Manilla, P. I.

Pastor, Woburn, Mass.

Professor, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.
Cleveland, O.

Southbury, Conn.

Pastor, Waukegan, Ill.

Y. M. C. A., India.

Missionary, Miyazaki, Japan

Business, Hartford, Conn.

Pastor, Richford, N. Y.

Pastor, Lynn, Mass.

(Mrs. J. P. Garfield), East Cleve-
land, O.

Pastor, New Vineyard, Me.

Pastor, Lonsdale, R. I.

Seattle, Wash.

Toronto, Ont.

Berea, Ky.

Business, Boston, Mass.

Oberlin, O.

Long Beach, Cal.

Hartford, Conn.

Melrose, Mass.

Paotingfu, China, Missionary Phy-
sician

New Britain, Conn. (Teacher)

Pastor, Sanbornton, N. H.

Pres., Marietta Coll., Marietta, O.

Pastor, Wayland, Mass.

Pastor, Denver, Colo.

DRYDEN W. PHELPS (1884)
 ELLSWORTH W. PHILLIPS 1891
 JAMES G. PHILLIPS 1906
 ARTHUR H. PINGREE 1898
 WALTER B. PITKIN* 1903
 STEPHEN C. PIXLEY 1855
 FRANK C. PORTER (1886)

JOHN S. PORTER 1891
 CLAYTON J. POTTER 1904
 HARRY P. POWERS* 1886
 HENRY POWERS 1860
 DWIGHT M. PRATT 1880
 HENRY H. PRATT 1901
 WILLIAM C. PRENTISS 1898
 THOMAS C. PRICE 1883
 WILLIAM M. PROCTOR (1904)
 IRVING T. RAAB (1904)
 DIKRAN H. RAJEBYAN 1900
 CHARLES P. REDFIELD 1898
 GEORGE W. REED 1887
 EMILY A. REEVE* 1902
 FRANKLIN H. REEVES 1906
 JOHN H. REID (1890)
 B. RUSH RHEES 1888

WINFRED C. RHOADES 1897
 DAVID P. RICE* (1898)
 THOMAS C. RICHARDS 1890
 ERNEST C. RICHARDSON* 1883

GEORGE C. RICHMOND 1898
 RICHARD S. W. ROBERTS 1904
 DAVID C. ROGERS* (1902)

DANIEL M. ROGERS 1906
 HELEN W. ROGERS* (1896)
 WILLIAM B. RONALD* (1903)
 SAMUEL ROSE 1887
 FREDERICK T. ROUSE 1886
 GEORGE M. ROWLAND 1886
 AUGUST RUECKER 1907
 WILLIAM H. SANDERS 1880
 EDWIN F. SANDERSON 1899
 LYDIA F. SANDERSON* 1898

JAMES B. SARGENT 1897
 SUMNER H. SARGENT 1901
 GEORGE W. SAVORY (1882)

Hueneme, Colo.
 Pastor, Whitman, Mass.
 Pastor, Mittineague, Mass.
 Pastor, Norwood, Mass.
 Columbia Univ., New York City
 Missionary, Inanda, Natal
 Professor, Yale Divinity Sch., New Haven, Conn.
 Missionary, Prague, Austria
 Pastor, Simsbury, Conn.
 Business, Proctor, Vt.

Pastor, Cincinnati, O.
 Littleton, Mass.
 Pastor, East Hartford, Conn.
 Pastor, Highland, Cal.
 Pastor, Ritzville, Wash.
 Pastor (Pres.) Cashmere, Wash.
 Hadjin, Turkey
 Pastor, Kingston, R. I.
 Pastor, Fort Yates, N. D.

Pastor, Lovell, Oxford Co., Me.
 Tacoma, Wash.
 President, Rochester Univ., Rochester, N. Y.
 Pastor, Roxbury, Mass.
 Rockland, Mass.
 Pastor, Warren, Mass.
 Librarian, Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J.
 St. George's Ch., Rochester, N. Y.
 Pastor, Northbridge, Mass.
 Instructor, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
 Missionary, Hadjin, Turkey
 (Mrs. A. K. Rodgers), Alfred, N. Y.
 East Saugus, Mass.
 Pastor, Cornwall, Vt.
 Pastor, Omaha, Neb.
 Missionary, Sapporo, Japan
 Pastor, Columbus, O. (1077 Bruck St.)
 Missionary, Kamordongo, W. Africa
 Pastor, Providence, R. I.
 (Mrs. E. W. Capen), Jamaica Plain, Mass.
 Pastor, Northfield, Vt.
 Pastor, Patten, Me.

- HENRY P. SCHAUFFLER 1898
 ARSENE B. SCHMAVONIAN 1899
 JOHN N. SCHUCH 1901
 ALBERT J. R. SCHUMAKER 1908
 CHARLES K. SCOON (1881)
 CHARLES SCOTT 1852
 LEWIS R. SCUDDER* 1885
- WILLIAM W. SCUDDER 1885
 JOSEPH H. SELDEN (1881)
 ROY W. SELLARS* (1906)
- ALLEN D. SEVERANCE* 1893
- BABA N. SHAHBAZ* 1899
 HARRY D. SHELDON (1880)
 JOSEPH B. SHEPARD 1881
 WILLIAM F. SHELDON 1906
 PETER B. SHIERE 1873
 ARLEY B. SHOW (1885)
 ALEXANDER SIEGENTHALER 1902
 CHARLES E. SIMMONS 1870
 BREVARD D. SINCLAIR (1887)
 WILLIAM SINCLAIR (1907)
 ARTHUR F. SKEELE (1881)
 EZRA A. SLACK (1831)
 HENRY D. SLEEPER 1891
- WILLIAM W. SLEEPER 1881
 CHARLES R. SMALL 1908
 CHARLES H. SMITH 1887
 EDWARD H. SMITH 1901
- JESSE F. SMITH 1899
- WILLIAM H. SMITH 1879
 M. PORTER SNELL 1868
 EVERARD W. SNOW 1901
 JAMES A. SOLANDT (1891)
 ALPHEUS M. SPANGLER 1888
 LEVERETT W. SPRING 1866
- IRVIN ST. JOHN (1861)
 CHARLES A. STANLEY, JR. (1904)
 DANIEL STAYER (1874)
 CHARLES M. STEARNS* (1901)
- WILLIAM F. STEARNS 1886
 LUTHER M. STRAYER 1903
- New York City
 Pastor, Constantinople, Turkey
 Pastor (Ger. Ev.), Big Springs, Mo.
 Fellow, Leipsic, Germany
 Business, Geneva, N. Y.
- Missionary Physician, Ranipettai,
 India
 Superintendent, Seattle, Wash.
 Pastor, Greenwich, Conn.
 Instructor, Univ. of Michigan, Ann
 Arbor, Mich.
 Professor Wn. Res. Univ., Cleve-
 land, O.
- Pastor, Lorain, O.
- Pastor (M. E.), Simsbury, Conn.
 West Somerville, Mass.
 Professor, Stanford Univ., Cal.
- Worcester, Mass.
 Rector (P. E.), Sacramento, Cal.
 Missionary, Colombo, Ceylon
 Pastor, Olivet, Mich.
 Brookline, Mass.
 Professor, Smith Coll., Northamp-
 ton, Mass.
- Pastor, Wellesley, Mass.
 7 Irving Terrace, Cambridge, Mass.
 Pastor, Barre, Mass.
 Norwich Town, Conn. (Missionary,
 Ing-hok, China)
 Missionary, Rangoon, Burmah (Sil-
 ver Lane, Conn.)
 Aurora, Ill.
 Anacostia, D. C.
 Pastor, Winsted, Conn.
 Rutland, Mass.
 Eureka, Kansas.
 Professor, Williams Coll., Williams-
 town, Mass.
 Pastor (Pres.)
 Missionary, Tientsin, China
 Pastor, Forest Grove, Oregon
 Instructor, Harvard Univ., Cam-
 bridge, Mass.
 Pastor, Norfolk, Conn.
 Hartford, Conn.

- HELEN L. STREET* (1905) (Mrs. W. W. Ranney), Hartford Conn.
 CHARLES B. STRONG 1876 R. F. D. 2, Torrington, Conn.
 DAVID H. STRONG 1885 Pastor, Williamstown, Vt.
 J. SELDEN STRONG 1894 Pastor, Limington, Me.
 WILLIAM E. STRONG 1885 Secretary, A. B. C. F. M.,
 14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 ALFRED L. STRUTHERS 1893 Pastor, Alfred, Me.
 FREDERICK A. SUMNER 1894 Pastor, Milford, Conn.
 HERMAN F. SWARTZ 1895 Pastor, Webster Groves, St. Louis, Mo.
 MILO J. SWEET 1905 Pastor, Hudson, Mich.
 GEORGE B. SWINNTERTON (1895) Pastor, Forty Fort, Pa.
 WILLIAM H. SYBRANDT 1879 Pastor, Troy, N. Y.
 TELESPHORE TAISNE 1902 Pastor, Auburn, Me.
 ELLIOTT F. TALMADGE 1900 Pastor, Wauregan, Conn.
 TATSU TANAKA* 1905 10 Nakarokubancho, Koyimachi, Tokyo, Japan
 WILLIAM J. TATE 1892 Pastor, Higganum, Conn.
 LEONARD B. TENNEY (1878) Pastor, Scotland, Conn.
 ISRAEL N. TERRY 1875 Pastor (Pres.), Utica, N. Y.
 ELWOOD G. TEWKSBURY 1890 Missionary, Tung-cho, China (Brooklyn, N. Y.)
 FREDERICK D. THAYER 1901 Pastor, Dudley, Mass.
 FRANK THOMPSON (1868) Chaplain, Valparaiso, Chile
 FRANKLIN C. THOMPSON 1906 Pastor, Charlemont, Mass.
 ARTHUR TITCOMB 1888 Springfield, Mass.
 ERNEST G. TOAN 1902 Teacher, Madison, Wis.
 ISAAC F. TOBEY 1871 Missionary, Smyrna, Turkey
 CHARLES K. TRACY 1904 Pastor, Hopkinton, Mass.
 A. FERDINAND TRAVIS 1897 Pastor, Richmond, Vt.
 EDWARD P. TREAT 1900 Pastor, Revillo, S. D.
 EUGENE B. TRE-FETHREN 1899 Pastor (Pres.), Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
 JOHN M. TROUT 1900 Missionary, Aintab, Turkey
 STEPHEN VAN R. TROWBRIDGE 1905 Pastor, Leominster, Mass.
 WILLIAM B. TUTHILL 1897 Tokyo, Japan
 JONATHAN K. UCHIMURA* (1890) Springfield, Mass.
 RUFUS S. UNDERWOOD (1868) Pastor, Marblehead, Mass.
 NICHOLAS VAN DER PYL 1893 28 Cornell St., Springfield, Mass.
 JAMES M. VAN DEUSEN* (1900) Business, 184 Franklin St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 DAVID E. VAN GIESON 1891 Rutherford, N. J.
 DANA M. WALCOTT (1868) Pastor, Hartford, Conn.
 PHILIP C. WALCOTT 1904 Ormond, Fla.
 GEORGE B. WALDRON 1887 Imperial, Cal.
 FREDERICK H. WALES 1875
 HENRY A. WALES (1867) Newington, Conn.
 WILLIAM S. WALKER 1891 Professor, Yale Divinity Sch., New Haven, Conn.
 WILLISTON WALKER* 1886

JEREMIAH E. WALTON (1856)
 FRANK E. WARFIELD 1870
 LYMAN WARNER (1857)
 BERTRAM A. WARREN (1904)
 FRANKLIN G. WEBSTER 1886
 CHARLES F. WEEDEN 1887
 NATHAN H. WEEKS* 1897
 NELSON W. WEHRAN (1907)
 MILO R. WEIDMAN 1905
 HENRY H. WENTWORTH (1892)
 WILLIAM W. WEST (1889)
 EDWARD F. WHEELER 1889
 SHELDON H. WHEELER (1875)
 KATRINE WHEELOCK* 1904

CYRUS B. WHITCOMB (1869)

WILLIAM F. WHITCOMB (1899)
 CHARLES E. WHITE 1900
 GEORGE E. WHITE (1887)
 WILLIAM F. WHITE 1890
 JOHN W. WHITTAKER 1887
 LAURA H. WILD 1896

GEORGE A. WILDER 1880

JOHN E. WILDEY (1893)
 WILLIAM L. WILKINSON 1902
 WALLACE W. WILLARD (1889)
 ALBERT R. WILLIAMS (1907)
 BENJAMIN A. WILLIAMS 1898
 HARRY T. WILLIAMS 1893
 MARY L. WILLIAMS* 1901
 JOSIAH G. WILLIS 1873
 GERHARDT A. WILSON 1892
 GEORGE W. WINCH 1875
 HENRY K. WINGATE 1893
 FRED M. WISWALL 1889
 OSCAR E. WITTLINGER 1901
 J. RALPH WOODCOCK (1902)
 CHARLES M. WOODMAN 1902
 WATSON WOODRUFF 1907
 WILLIAM S. WOODRUFF (1875)
 EDWARD S. WORCESTER 1901
 WILLIAM H. WORRELL 1906

RICHARD WRIGHT 1890
 NEWTON G. WRIGHT (1906)

Rector (P. E.), Sturgis, Mich.
 Pastor, Milford, Mass.
 Salisbury, Conn.
 Quaker Hill, N. Y.
 Pastor, De Ruyter, N. Y.
 Pastor, Lynn, Mass.

Red Lodge, Montana
 Pastor, Wisner, Neb.
 Pastor, Terre Haute, Ind.
 Pastor (Bapt.).
 Pastor, New Ulm, Minn.
 Long Beach, Cal.
 Instructor, Wellesley Coll., Wellesley, Mass.

Lawyer, 759 Gates Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Westminster, Vt.
 Pastor, Amherst, N. H.
 Missionary, Marsovan, Turkey
 Hinsdale, N. H.
 Tuskegee, Ala.
 Y. W. C. A. Univ., Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.

Missionary, Mt. Silinda, Melssetter Dist., Rhodesia, E. Africa
 Pastor (Pres.), Manchester, N. H.
 Pastor (M. E.), West Elizabeth, Pa.
 Aurora, Ill.
 Pastor, South Boston, Mass.
 Knoxville, Tenn.
 511 Schultz Bldg., Columbus, O.
 79 Howe St., New Haven, Conn.
 Wilbraham, Mass.
 Swampscott, Mass.
 Barre, Vt.
 Missionary, Caesarea, Turkey
 Pastor, Newfane, Vt.
 Pastor (Ger. Ev.), Tonawanda, N. Y.
 Birmingham, Penn.
 Pastor, Portland, Me.
 Assistant Pastor, New Britain, Conn.

Pastor, Norwich, Conn.
 1112 Washmetaw Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Pastor, Cambridge, Mass.
 Pastor (M. E.), Pleasant Valley Conn.

ERNEST A. YARROW 1904
PHILIP W. YARROW 1899

Missionary, Van, Turkey
Pastor, Waveland Ave. Ch., Chicago,
Ill.

JAMES C. YOUNG* (1905)

90 State St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

HENRY J. ZERCHER 1879

Salem, Oregon

ALBIN R. ZINK 1902

Pastor (Ger. Ev.), Le Roy, N. H.

GRADUATE AND SPECIAL STUDENTS.

GEORGE ADAMS G. 1893-4

Pastor (M. E.), Bay Ridge, N. Y.

GARABED B. ADENALAIN G. 1904-5

Hartford, Conn.

SAMUEL ANGUS G. 1906-

WILLIAM J. BAKER* S. 1891-2.

Hartford, Conn.

RUTH BECKWITH S. 1907-

LOUIS W. A. BJORKMAN S. 1889-90

Chicago, Ill.

FRANCES M. BLATCHFORD* S. 1897-8

Springfield, Mass.

GEORGE C. BLISS G. 1896-7

Hartford, Conn.

HELEN E. BROWN* S. 1901-3

Lahaiua, T. H.

COLLINS G. BURNHAM S. 1888-91

Hartford, Conn.

MARY S. BUSHNELL* S. 1904-5

Secretary, Woman's Board, Boston,
Mass. 14 Beacon St.

HELEN B. CALDER* S. 1899-1900.

HELEN C. CARSWELL* S. 1900-1

Pastor, Wethersfield, Conn.

GEORGE L. CLARKE S. 1899-1900

Trinidad, W. I.

FULTON J. COFFIN G. 1902-3

Pastor (Christian), Providence, R. I.
Godfrey, Ill.

GEORGE A. CONIBEARE G. 1903-4

East Orange, N. J.

HARRY A. COTTON 1893-4

Pastor (M. E.), Bakersfield, Vt.

DAVID B. EDDY G. 1902-4

JACOB FINGER G. 1902-3

JOHN FORSYTHE G. 1907-8

JOHN P. GAVIT S. 1893-6

Hartford, Conn.

MARY A. GOODMAN* S. 1896-8

Missionary, Japan

FANNIE GRISWOLD S. 1905-6

Teacher, Konia, Turkey

ARMENAG H. HAIGAZIAN* G. 1895-6

Pastor, Randolph, Mass.

CHRISTOPHER R. HAMLIN G. 1907-8

Thompson, Conn.

ARNOLD V. HUIZINGA G. 1906-8

Bible House, Constantinople, Turkey
Manchester Road, Warrington,
England

PARNAK H. ISKENDRIAN S. 1896-7

DAVID R. JAMES G. 1892-3

Washburn Coll., Topeka, Kansas
Pastor, Greenwich, O.

JOHN E. KIRKPATRICK G. 1907-8

OWEN JENKINS G. 1886-7

ALICE W. JONES S. 1905-6

Pastor (Pres.), Upland, Ind.

HARRIS L. LATHAM G. 1901-2

MARINDA A. LOCKE* S. 1893-4

JOHN F. LYONS G. 1905-6

Messina, Italy

GIUSEPPE MERLINO S. 1897-8

South Glastonbury, Conn.

JOHN W. MCCOMBE G. 1906-8

Rector (P. E.), Philadelphia, Pa.

HARRY K. B. OGLE G. 1902-3

Montclair, N. J.

J. O. AUGUST OSTROM G. 1894-5

- EDWIN M. PICKOP S. 1899-02
 ALBERT H. PLUMB S. 1891-2 Pastor, Lakeville, Conn.
 CHARLIE C. PRATT S. 1900-1
 JONATHAN W. PURCELL G. 1903-4 Santa Fé, N. M.
 MAE L. RICHARDS* S. 1899-1900 Washington, D. C.
 FREDERICK B. RIGGS* S. 1899-90 Santee Agency, Neb.
 JAMES H. ROBERTS G. 1906-7 West Suffield, Conn.
 EMMA G. ROGERS* S. 1906-7
 ROBERT SCOTT* S. 1902-3 Editor, *Homiletical Review*, Montclair, N. J.
 ALICE E. SMITH* S. 1905-6. (Mrs. F. C. Thompson), Charle-
 mont, Mass.
 GEORGE B. SMITH S. 1906-7
 SAMUEL SIMPSON G. 1895-7 Professor, H. T. S., Hartford, Conn.
 SANJI SONE* G. 1906-7
 JOHN A. SPENCER G. 1901-2 Pastor, Agra, Okl.
 VALUE STANCHEFF S. 1888-9
 ALICE B. STEBBINS S. 1901-3 (Mrs. Frank Wells), Perry, Okla.
 SUGIYOSHI SUGIYAMA S. 1896-7
 WALTER P. TAYLOR S. 1889-90 Boston, Mass.
 MAUD E. TEMPLE S. 1906-7
 GRACE H. TEWKSBURY* S. 1889-90 (Mrs. Elwood G. Tewksbury), Mis-
 sionary, Tung-cho, China
 ALBERT B. TODD S. 1901-3 Pastor (Bapt.), Stafford, Conn.
 J. SPENCER VOORHEES G. 1897-8 Pastor, Adams, Mass.
 DAVID WALLACE S. 1896-7 Pastor, Presque Isle, Me.
 FRANK P. WATERS S. 1906-7 Pastor, Rocky Hill, Conn.
 ARTHUR C. WILLIAMS* 1900-4 Hartford, Conn.
 JAMES A. WOOD S. 1894-6 Pastor (M. E.), East Hampton,
 Conn.
 HENRY B. WOODS G. 1901-2 Pastor (Bapt.), Dexter, Me.
 WILLIAM WOZENCRAFT G. 1905-6

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

VOL. XIX, NO. 2—APRIL, 1909.

[Entered at the Hartford Post Office as Second Class Matter.]

Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 30 cents. Remit to Order of HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS, Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Conn.

EDITORIAL BOARD :—Professor Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor Waldo Selden Pratt, Professor Austin Bradley Bassett. *Business Manager* :—Eugene Barnard Smith.

The RECORD in this issue presents to its readers a "Student Number," in which all of the contributed articles are supplied by students from papers which they have been called on to present in the regular course of their Seminary duties. It is felt that a double interest attaches to them, first on account of their intrinsic worth, and second as revealing certain phases of the work of a modern theological seminary in both its methods and results. The paper of Mr. Walter is abbreviated from his thesis handed in for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity; Mr. Allen's article was originally delivered as an address at one of the "General Exercises" last February; Mr. Holmes' paper was read in connection with the regular work of the Junior Class in the course on Great Pastors and Preachers; and Mr. Thomson's paper was called forth in connection with the brief course in Propadeutics which outlines to incoming students the purposes and plans of a theological education.

Everybody recognizes more or less clearly that the newer methods of interpreting the New Testament, especially as influenced by the study of the history of religion and the application of principles derived from this study to Christianity, has led to views in respect to historic Christianity, and to him from whom the religion takes its name, which are quite at variance with those traditionally held. Two articles in the January theological reviews have the merit of bringing these differences

to the attention of the general reader with a precision which is clarifying. We venture to call attention to these in connection with the recent book of Dr. James Denney on *Jesus and the Gospel*. One of these articles appears in the *American Journal of Theology* and is by Professor Arthur C. McGiffert, who writes on the question "Was Jesus or Paul the founder of Christianity?" The other appears in the *Hibbert Journal* and bears the title "Jesus or Christ?" It is written by Rev. R. Roberts of Bradford, England. The latter is written from a distinctly, even polemically, Unitarian standpoint, which is not of course true of the article by Professor McGiffert.

Mr. Roberts writes "Evangelicalism has found itself driven to make stupendous claims on behalf of Jesus." This presents to his mind a serious difficulty which he will put in the form of the following questions: are these claims "made on behalf of a spiritual 'ideal' to which we may provisionally apply the word 'Christ,' or are they predicated of Jesus?" These questions he protests, the apologists do not frankly meet. In the method employed by evangelical theology "Jesus imparts to Christ His own historicity and character; Christ assimilates Jesus. The two make one person." The phrase the "historical Christ," he says, embarrasses him. "If it means an enriching and expanding 'Ideal' to which history bears its witness, and from the hope inspired by which humanity may draw encouragement and strength in its conflict with ignorance" he will subscribe himself a believer and will admit that this "Ideal" has a history and is so far historical. But he protests that it is impossible to identify this ideal with Jesus, and urges further that the identification of the two so identifies Jesus with God as to land one in theological difficulties that are insurmountable: for by so doing "they make God a Being who is omnipotent, yet limited in power," etc., — proceeding in a vein familiar to one somewhat at home in the field of Unitarian literature. Now the point we would emphasize is not the place where Mr. Roberts comes out, but the door through which he goes in. This is the insistence, on historical grounds, upon the difference between the ideas represented by the words "Jesus" and "Christ," and the

impossibility of uniting the two so that the term "Jesus Christ" has any clearly intelligible content.

Professor McGiffert confines himself much more closely to the historical discussion and in considering the question as to whether Jesus or Paul was the founder of Christianity, he says that "the question may be considered from three points of view: the relation of Jesus and Paul to the Christian movement, to the Christian church as an institution, and to the content of historical Christianity." The treatment of the first two is made subordinate to, and largely dependent, on the discussion of the third. In regard to the Christian practice of prayer to Christ or through Christ, and similarly in respect to the sacraments, the influence of Paul has been determinative of the attitude of the Christian Church, and in both respects is in opposition to the teaching of Jesus. In regard to the "theoretical content" of Christianity we are told that it was due to the interpretation of man as sinner, through his relation to Adam, and his consequent need of a Saviour that there came to be developed the doctrine of the saving work of Christ. "Upon this idea of Christ's work was based the historic belief in his diety. As a mere prophet he might instruct men and set before them an example of perfect obedience, but only as he was divine could he by his indwelling endow human nature with incorruption and immortality, or pay an adequate price for men's redemption." Now, by a comparison of the Pauline and Johannine literature with the Synoptic narratives, Professor McGiffert judges it to be clear that this "body of teaching came from some other source than Jesus himself, and the conclusion can hardly be resisted that it came from Paul, in whose writings it is first found, and whose own experience fully accounts for its origin." Paul's "view of man and his need are totally at variance with Christ's, and if this is true of the fundamental elements of Paul's system, it is true also of their corollaries, the doctrine of salvation, of the person and work of Christ, of the church and the sacraments." But though Paul's influence has been the dominant one in Christianity throughout its historic development, yet with it there has been another element that has not wholly been lost

sight of, and for this element we are indebted to Jesus. "The piety of Jesus — his vivid realization of God as his father and the father of his brethren, and his attitude of perfect trust and joyful devotion — has been a priceless and imperishable heritage of the Christian Church. The conclusion is thus reached that "without Jesus Christianity and the Christian Church would certainly not have been," and that his doctrine of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood, overlaid though it has been by doctrine and practice not accordant with it, is the thing that came from Jesus and has "the greatest worth" of anything in Christianity; and it is this "which chiefly accounts for the hold of Christianity on the modern world." On the other hand the historic doctrines of the person and work of Christ are "corollaries" deduced by Paul from false premises respecting both the nature of man and the character of Jesus.

Here then we have again clear-cut the distinction and the irreconcilable contrast drawn between Christ, the conception of whose person and work has been fundamental to the development of historical Christianity, and Jesus who taught and lived the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in "perfect trust and joyful devotion," and whose teaching and example supply the permanently valuable in the Christian religion. And the insistence that the church in every age, through all the multitudinous ways in which it has tried to formulate it, has always been at fault in making the emphasis of its faith to lie on the person and work of Christ rather than solely on the teaching and living of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood by Jesus.

This is the issue which Dr. Denney in his admirable book draws sharp. "Christianity," he says, "never existed in the world as a religion in which men shared the faith of Jesus, but was from the very beginning, and amid all undeniable diversities, a religion in which Jesus was the object of faith. To all believers Jesus belonged to the divine as truly as to the human sphere." To this statement Professor McGiffert, and perhaps Mr. Roberts, would quite probably assent as the expression of a

fact respecting historic Christianity. But then the vital questions come, Has the whole evolution of Christianity been a mistake? Did Paul, John, and the other early preachers of Christianity, even though they were nearest to him and knew him, many of them personally, make an entire mistake as to what he was and what his significance and value for them were? Did neither the death of Jesus, nor his resurrection, however aridly interpreted, contribute elements of value in interpreting the life and character of the Master? Must Jesus, to be understood, always be viewed without perspective? Must each word and event of his life be examined solely from the standpoint of a temporal parallelism? But these general considerations, weighty though they must be, are not the ones Dr. Denney chiefly emphasizes. He pushes on to what must always be the ultimate question, what was Jesus' consciousness of himself? Does he here appear to be such in his own nature and in his relation to God and to men as to make the inferences of historic Christianity true; — not true in all their dogmatic and contradictory affirmations, but true in their recognition that the Christ is properly the object, not simply the pattern, of the Christian faith, so that men are warranted in having faith in him as well as believing him? It is to the fine elaboration of this inquiry, that Dr. Denney applies himself, and he reaches a well-justified conclusion in direct opposition to the conclusions of the other writers.

All questions in Christian theology and Christian practice must ultimately become Christological, and it is evident that the esoteric studies of scholars have reached the point where they must be thought out in the open. There is no question more crucial than this, whether the Christian doctrine and the Christian experience of almost two thousand years have been at fault. Whether Paul and Jesus are founders of rival religions. Whether the phrase "Jesus Christ" is a self-contradictory inexplicability. Whatever their other divergencies, McGiffert, Roberts, Denney agree that here we are face to face with ultimate irreconcilables. Between these positions we are confident there is no uncertainty as to which the Christian Church will choose. It will choose not because of a love for the traditional,

not because of the inertia of an evolutionary process, not because of the intricate involutions of the Synoptic Problem, or the relative primacy of different documents. It will choose because the self-revelation of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels will continue to lead sinful men to thrill before the august graciousness of the personality there made manifest, and will be convinced that nothing less than the recognition of him as Jesus the Christ will account for the facts. It will choose because it will continue to judge it inconceivable that the religious experience of those first believers in Christ could have rested in anything other than the real character of the Jesus whom they had known and whom they declared to be both Christ and Lord.

An examination of the "Happenings in the Seminary" will show that the close of this seminary year will bring to the friends and alumni of the institution two interesting occasions. The first is the celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Theological Institute of Connecticut at East Windsor Hill, the preparations for which ensure an interesting program. The second is the ministerial retreat, beginning the first of June, and at which Rev. R. F. Horton will be one of the chief speakers, and which promises to be as richly serviceable as was the similar occasion four years ago.

THE CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE OF MORAL SUFFERING IN SOCIAL REDEMPTION.

I

INTRODUCTION.

The unfolding of this paper is designed to represent the ideal application of an ultimate principle, outside of time, to certain temporal conditions of the world in which we live; and it will present this principle as the only basis of solving the problems involved in those conditions. Socialism, which eagerly offers to solve those problems, rests upon an economic foundation, and professes no kinship (if not actual lack of sympathy) with religion. It assumes to present the ideal economic form within which, only, human happiness may be realized. I have not seen the essence of socialism better expressed than in a volume entitled "An Inquiry into Socialism," by Thomas Kirkup, in which the author says: "Socialism is a new form of social organization based on a new form of industrial organization . . . its essence is an economic change. Everything else is accidental, and in the view of socialism non-essential." My quarrel with socialism is not fundamentally with regard to its "form of social organization," but as to its bold and blind assertion that everything beyond the economic is accidental and non-essential. As I read the books of socialists I ask over and over, But how shall I know that this and this, which you advocate, is essential? Granted the relative importance of the industrial and social organization, how shall I know which form of organization is right, when you gentlemen yourselves are far from agreeing? What is your organizing principle? And finally, coming to what I think is the essential thing, how are you going to fill that ideal form of yours with the ideal content for which it was created? Some of your incidental demands seem to me self-

evident, but my questions concern what you claim are the essentials of your propaganda, which divorces man, economically, from man, religiously.

My desire has been to find a principle by which I may so undubitably ascertain the needs of "all sorts and conditions of men" that I can construct my economic and social program, step by step, not from an assumed conception of what all men ought to have, or from a conception colored by my own selfish convictions of what I myself appear to need, or from a standpoint which lacks comparative discrimination between the economic, social, and religious needs of men, but from a knowledge of what actually and absolutely is the real composite need of each individual member of the human race. And this principle, furthermore, must not only show me his needs, but provide also a dynamic whereby I may move him toward regeneration. It is this principle, which I have designated by the name, moral suffering, which first I shall seek briefly to set forth. I shall then attempt to sketch very briefly present conditions, teeming with problems and yawning with perils which evince so appalling a need of immediate remedy. Finally, I shall seek to bring principle and conditions together in a constructive demonstration of how through this means the problems which so vex and straiten the souls of men must inevitably and naturally work themselves out in the happiest solution.

II

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF MORAL FELLOWSHIP.

The world of my knowledge comprises three factors: God, man, and the physical universe, commonly called Nature. The biggest fact which has entered my world of knowledge is the fact of personality, which I use to describe that composite of conscience, reason, and volition which in their activities are the expressions of *me*. This fact of personality I at once ascribe to God, since it is that in myself which is farthest removed from the animal below, and which must therefore represent the beginning of my conception of God above. Personality can be known only through the relationships in which it exists and

expresses itself, and hence all I know of the personality of God and of man I know through their relations in themselves, to each other, and to Nature. At this point let nature be dropped from the discussion, since we are concerned only with the personalities of God and man in their mutual and internal relationships. The relations existing between God and man, and between man and man give us the starting-point for our discussion of moral fellowship and moral suffering. How shall these relationships be determined?

God's alleged revelations to man have been many, and none have passed unchallenged before the bar of man's skepticism. All of the others pale into insignificance, or pass without dispute, with the acceptance of the historicity in our world of one great creative act of God — the introduction into our world of one of the persons of the Godhead, the Son, Jesus Christ. Through Him, supremely, if I concede Him to be the Son of God, I obtain my knowledge of what God is, and of what is His relationship to man, His creature; and also, now for the first time, of what is the ideal relationship between man and man. The chief source of my belief that Jesus is the Son of God is to be found in the writings of the group of men who were nearest to the alleged facts, and upon whose minds they left their deeply and sharply engraved impression. From their writings, as my authority, therefore, I gain my knowledge of God in Christ, and of His relations to His creature, man. Some relationship has been accepted by all believers in God with uncritical alacrity. Man is the child of God, and the brother of his fellow man. What, we inquire, are the implications of those vaguely assumed relationships? My present objective then is to determine more concretely the relationship existing between God and man and between man and man; and in order to do this I must know wherein the moral nature of God and the moral nature of man ultimately differ and wherein they are alike. In other words, I must delimit the sphere of moral fellowship within which God and man meet.

My problem is simplified at once by the fact already referred to, that God was in Jesus. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." His glory was the revelation of the glory of

the Father — a fullness of “grace and truth.” I think we may follow John in emphasizing and studying those two words as the fulfilment of all righteousness. We have Jesus’s word, as well as His life, for the fact that God is love, or grace — that from Him love proceeds; and by love I mean an outgoing, an outgiving, of self into other selves for the purpose of their benefit. It is what God essentially does. We know that man is not love, but that from Him some love may and does proceed. We know from the life and the lips of Him who said, “I am the way, the truth, and the life,” that God is truth, that in Him truth inheres; and by truth I intend perfect fidelity to the laws and demands of His own Being. It is conjoined and sublimated self-preservation, self-regard and self-assertiveness. It is what God essentially is. We know that man is not truth, but in man some truth may and does inhere. God is absolutely righteous, and by righteousness I mean the perfect balance in Him of love and truth, which is only to say over again that God *is* love and God *is* truth. In Him, revealed and interpreted by Christ, there is the perfect poise of a self conserved in truth and outpoured in love. Jesus had utmost regard for His own integrity and for others’ needs. Man is relatively righteous. Love and truth in him are not perfectly adjusted, and as a consequence his personality is out of poise. God’s command is that we shall love our neighbor as ourself. If there is no self-love, no attention to the requirements and the honor of one’s self, no rock-bottom of truth, there is no norm for neighbor-love, and it will run riot and lose itself in futile forms of activity. On the other hand, if there is no neighbor-love, no outgoing of one’s personality into other lives, there is no certain limit to self-love, and it will develop into overweening conceit.

Thus we see that God is, on the moral plane, what man ought to be, and may be in process of becoming. Man, therefore, is the child of God, dependent upon Him in the moral condition of truth received, reaching toward Him in the moral reaction of love expressed, a mutual relationship. If God is truth and love in their infinity, man has truth and love, though he be finite, in proportion as he approximates the ideal relationship which God intended for His children.

What that original relationship was we cannot fully know, for what God purposed for man, man did not purpose for himself. We live in a world and at an age in which the relationship between God and man is imperfect, and we can only presume an original perfect moral fellowship in the mind of the Creator from the beginning. What the disruption of that perfect moral fellowship meant for God, when man severed the filial relation, and then exaggerated the egoism and perverted the altruism, we see dramatically set forth in history in the atoning life and death of Jesus Christ. In Him God's original purpose of a perfect humanity was realized and through His coming, and revealing God and His ideal for the race, the present relationship above described between man and God was made possible.

It is here that moral fellowship merges in moral suffering. In order to reestablish in some form the severed relationship it was necessary that God and man should meet once more on the moral plane where the original mutualness of love and truth could operate in fellowship. As man might not of himself rise up to God from whom he had wilfully turned away, God, in the person of Jesus, descended to man, entered into his experiences, and came under the dominion of the law of destruction, of sin and death, though He knew no sin. After a galling experience in the throes of a social system which man had evolved in his broken relationship, in which there was no room for God (save as individuals partially broke from it), he was borne down to physical death at the hands of His wayward children. Through His meeting man and getting under and sharing the effects of the burden of his sin, moral fellowship between God and man again became possible, but ever after coterminous with the realm of moral suffering, the eternal cost of an eternally becoming relationship.

Why all this travail of soul to effect man's redemption, instead of a simple word of forgiveness? God's divine righteousness, confirming both truth and love, was involved, and He could not, because of what He is and of what man's conscience at its highest demands, lightly condone the sin and easily restore man, with his wilful disobedience, to that fellowship with Himself which man had forfeited. There is a deeper principle operat-

ing here, a sterner requirement, namely, moral suffering. The tragedy of Lincoln's life and death affords an illuminating instance of the operation of this principle in history. The father, in the parable, forgave the prodigal returning from his husks, and crying in wretched shame, "I am no more worthy to be called thy son"; but it was a forgiveness shot through with moral suffering as he entered into the shame and abhorrence of his son's sin. "From the sphere of our sorrow," so circumscribed and, comparatively, so insignificant, we can only wonder what must have been the cost of bearing a whole world's sorrow for sins not (or but dimly) realized, and we listen in a silence of awesome reverence and vaguest comprehension to Jesus's pregnant words, "if it be possible let this cup pass from me": "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

I have tried to show how between man and God, as personal beings, there has been a permanent relationship of love and trust, in the sphere of moral fellowship, merging into moral suffering with the straining of the relationship on the side of man. Coming to the mutual relations between man and man, do we find, playing back and forth between them, the same potential moral fellowship and moral suffering? I believe that we do. There is for the individual Christian no such thing as ideals of love and truth (the two poles of righteous personality) in the abstract. They exist only as they are realized in deeds. Therefore, all that has hitherto been said about love and truth toward God has no meaning except as there is introduced the further factor of other men. In proportion as a man's subjective attitude is that of a loving truthful individual, it will of necessity issue objectively in right relationship to both God and other men. And just as my relationship to God, as His child, entails certain very real and necessary duties, so my inevitable relations with my fellow men, if they be in any degree right relations, carry with them concomitant obligations. In my social relations I am required to seek the same just equipoise of love and truth. As God's child and man's brother I must preserve my own integrity with unflinching rigor, and I must devote my energies to the well being of my fellow men in considerate love. So here again we are within the realm of moral fellowship. And there is no

other real fellowship among men, universally conceived, for fellowship implies equality of situation, community of interests and correspondence of ideals, and the only world in which men meet as actual equals, where there is correspondence of situation, is the moral world. All men have sinned and come short of the glory of God, that is, they have broken the ideal relationship God planned for His children, which was to have constituted His glory—a fellowship of absolutely righteous humanity. Furthermore, all men are conscious of that broken relationship, however suffused that consciousness may have become.

Here is a platform, built of the ultimates in every man's experience, where he meets every other man on equal terms, and is joined to them, whether or not he recognizes the fact, by fraternal bonds. All men whose lives I touch are my brothers in this most vital sense, and in my dealings with them I am constrained to effect continually the requisite balance of truth and love. In what, morally, will those dealings consist? My personal honor must be inviolate. Truth, which is the foundation-stone of social well-being, must be my only policy. With regard to the outgoings of love, I would make at this time one general statement of what I believe constitutes a man's duty to his brother men. It is this: I owe to my fellow men such actions as will hinder not at all, and further to the utmost of my power, the potential trend in them toward the perfect balance between truth and love which constitutes righteous personality. We have now staked out our claim of ideal moral fellowship, the only real fellowship among men. The disruption of the ideal relationship bringing to pass the transition from moral fellowship to moral suffering in order to society's ultimate redemption, will be dealt with in the two succeeding sections.

III

THE DISRUPTION OF MORAL FELLOWSHIP IN SOCIETY

I have no time nor space to trace the historic aspects of this subject and show how, all down the ages, sin has acted as a divisive element not alone between man and God, but between man and man. Sin has shattered *all* right relationships and

there is necessity of reconciliation all along the line. Man's highest interests all center in Christ in the sphere of moral fellowship and suffering.

My desire in this section is to tell once more, succinctly, the story which so many are telling today, of present menacing conditions, which all good men decry, in the midst of which some despair, and out beyond which many dare to hope. We have seen that for mankind life is a matter of personal relationships, and that only as they are adjusted to the noblest ethical ends is real equality and fellowship (and, therefore, real happiness) possible, since the ultimate sphere of equality and fellowship for man universally, is the moral world. In a society where all men respect their own honor, and love their fellows as themselves, the welfare of all is assured in an atmosphere of ideal moral fellowship. That, in terms of essentials, is the Utopia of which we dream, in which incidental details would naturally adjust themselves.

The trouble with society today into which sin has entered is, fundamentally, that men do not follow their consciences. Hence self-distrust is born and with it comes inevitably distrust of others and that fear of them which casts out love. The more highly society is organized, the more necessary trust becomes, and the more subversive of happiness grows its dissolution. In primitive society men were comparatively self-dependent, and their relationships were few, however essential. In our day we must rely on the honesty of other men for our happiness and our health — for our very lives. A man is dependent on others for his safety as he travels on trains he did not construct, eats and drinks meals others have provided, and lives in homes builded by other hands. Do we find that with greater interdependence the feeling of responsibility has deepened on the one hand, and any evidence of trust has been justified on the other? Unfortunately, no, for with the added opportunity to serve has come an added opportunity to swerve—to be untrue. Human nature is at present selfish, and it is weak. Building a house, or a bridge, or a car for his own use solely, a man will proceed with care and economy. In building for another there is the temptation for the mason to do shoddy work and for the contractor to

charge exorbitant rates. "Character is what a man is in the dark," it has been said. Shall a man be true when no one will know of his falseness? Right here we begin to see the "rift within the lute" of an harmonious humanity. The more a man has, the greater is his advantage over his poorer brother. Money is potent in a humanity which is weak, and desires it supremely. Money will purchase influence in the legislature, on the bench, in the police station, upon the impartiality of all of which the welfare of society is staked. For the poor man who has nothing and desires a loaf of bread and steals it, the jail yawns. For a rich man who has money and influence, and desires a certain franchise and steals it, success may wait with a crown of laurel.

With the growing complexity of civilization and necessity of interdependence, the poor who have not, become increasingly dependent on the honesty of the rich who have. Granted that both parties are selfish and weak, and that the former is continually deceiving the latter when it is possible and worth his while, the fact remains that to the latter belongs far the greater opportunity and incentive. Nothing but sheer villainy or egregious laziness would cause a mason to lay his bricks helter skelter, if he could do so without discovery. His best interests will obviously be subserved by honesty. But for the contractor there is the incentive of covetousness, and, provided there is an opportunity for graft with chances favoring immunity, even if discovered, honesty for him is not the best policy, humanly speaking. With greater wealth and position go greater and more subtle forms of temptation to dishonesty, which may simply mean an acquiescence in the dishonest ways of a morally purblind world. A rich man's sins may be in perfect accord with the low ethical code of his neighbors in an atmosphere where his act is accepted and supported by a distorted public opinion, listlessly, and by his fellow-sinners, actively—their interests being jeopardized if his act attains disrepute. The breach is growing wider, is becoming for many on each side well-nigh impassable. It is ramifying out in all directions, in minor chasms. Wherever there is trust there is the opportunity of betrayal, and ere long a man may be found betraying his erstwhile companions and drawing still further into the isolation of sin. The man

who retains a "childlike" trust in his fellows is laughed at as ignorant of the ways of the world. The man who would do as he would be done by is told, with a shrug, that the golden rule of that good dreamer of Nazareth is, of course, not practicable in our twentieth century society. Because there is distrust everywhere, we are visited with a plethora of investigating committees whose creation is, unfortunately, usually proved to have been justified. Although some strange anomalous flowers may be springing there, forming a fragrant covering, there is "muck" on all hands to be raked, and we know not whom another hour (and ambitious journalist) may bring forth into the light of aroused popular condemnation.

As competition, with its evils, gives way to corporation control, with its different evils, the shifting of individual accountability grows more common, and excuses therefor more plausible. As the breach widens the men on the other side are seen less as individuals and more in the mass. Their individual wrongs are blurred and their total interests are disregarded. The manufacturer, who at some discomfort is teaching a Sunday-school class of little girls on Sundays, is hiring a hundred little children to labor in his factory on week days, thus warping, irremediably, their mental, physical and moral development. The capitalist may be loved by his butler or his gardener for many kindnesses and for generous pay; but, ask how his "hands" feel toward him? The response to selfish disregard of the interests of others is hatred on the part of those whose interests are disregarded, and the hatred is reciprocated. Labor is everywhere combining to fight entrenched and tyrannical capital, and it becomes at once a question of which can gain a strangle hold on the other. On either side the individual is not even free to be fair if his side is unfair. The capitalist must observe the prices his fellow-capitalists observe, the druggist must adulterate as do his fellow-druggists; and on the other side the laborer must obey the walking delegate (who may be a potential traitor) and strike, no matter what agreements and sentiments of his own are violated — or he becomes "a scab" and walks abroad in danger of insult, injury, or death.

The situation is all but intolerable, and both sides are dis-

satisfied and are giving here and there indications of willingness to come together if they can but discover the *modus operandi*. From the moral point of view the situation I have pictured represents the issue of the broken relationship described in the first section. Men do not observe (because they cannot, or will not, or know it not) a true code of honor. Men invariably ascribe to others their own characters, and hence springs distrust and hatred. The chasm that stretched between man and God is paralleled between man and man, where fundamental human brotherhood is forgotten and minor surface inequalities are emphasized.

IV

MORAL SUFFERING FOR SOCIAL REDEMPTION

We have witnessed the breach between man and God, thwarting the original purpose of perfect moral fellowship; and we have seen how Jesus drew that breach together so that fellowship again became possible, by suffering as God in His sorrow for man's sin, and by suffering as man amid his many sorrows—the fruits of his sin. He knew both sides, He felt both sides, and in His own person made atonement and achieved reconciliation, at a cost which we cannot wholly know. We have beheld the breach between man and man, widening with the years and destroying the possibility of moral (the only real) fellowship. How shall that chasm be bridged, is our question. "By Christ and His atonement," is the (orthodox) reply. But that is not all, for Christ chooses to work in the world today through His disciples, and even as, alone, He made reconciliation between God and man, so it is for His Spirit, active in the Christian church and in individual Christians, to reconcile man to his brother man, ameliorate the sin-brought sorrows of the world and adjust it into harmony with the principles Jesus enunciated when upon the earth. It is for us by our sufferings in behalf of the world to fill up on our part that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ; and which will be lacking till the last wrong upon earth is righted. The first aim of the church must ever be to unite men organically with God's Holy Spirit in right individual relationship. The second aim must be to unite them fraternally

with their fellow men in right social relationship. I cannot credit the man who claims Christ has redeemed him, who yet is not busy redeeming his fellows and redeeming society through the power of Christ's Spirit in his own life. Thus are the sufferings of Christ filled up and made effective for, and by, each succeeding generation of men.

In the remaining pages of this paper there are two questions demanding to be answered. (1) Granted the primary acceptance of reconciliation with God in Christ, what further does moral reconciliation of one's fellows involve? (2) Who are to lead in this work of man's reconciliation to man, the renewal of moral fellowship, in which society's redemption consists?

(1) The saviour of society today must know men, as Jesus did. He must know them not superficially but fundamentally. He must have a passion for gaining other men's points of view. He must be like the good grey poet of our land, who rode with teamsters on their loads, chatted with policemen on their beats, played with little children, and suffered with wounded soldiers on their cots. No wonder Walt Whitman could write of Christ, scarce realizing perhaps the full bearing of the words:

"Then the mechanics take Him for a mechanic,
And the soldiers suppose Him to be a soldier, and the sailors
that He has followed the sea;
The authors take Him for an author, and the artists for an
artist, and the laborers perceive that He would labor with
them and love them;
No matter what the work is that He is the one to follow it, or
has followed it;
No matter what the nation that He finds brothers and sisters
there.
The English believe that He comes from their English stock,
A Jew to the Jew He seems, a Russ to the Russ, usual, near,
removed from none,
A gentleman of his perfect blood acknowledges His perfect blood.
The insulter, the angry person, the beggar, see themselves in
the ways of Him, He strangely transmutes them.
They are not vile any more; they hardly know themselves they
are so grown."

Such as that was the universality of the knowledge and experience of Jesus. He knew what was in all men and could be limited by no unappreciated point of view; therefore He saw

life whole, and His principles, founded upon that knowledge, cannot and can never be overthrown. Why are there such varieties of panaceas put forth by good and honest men who do or who do not favor the existing order? Because each is colored and narrowed in his convictions by his own point of view or that of his class. The labor unionist has not appreciated the viewpoint of the capitalist, nor the capitalist of the labor unionist.

The more universal, and hence the more Christ-like a man becomes, the more qualified and certain he will be to rule and to suffer. History in the large and in the little justifies this statement. The man who sees deep down into and all around and therefore truly weighs every individual and every problem (the motives of the one and the elements of the other) is the man who slowly forges to the front, through his recognized freedom from partisan spirit, his inveterate justice, his insight into the total community need as against the desires of certain acquisitive individuals. Evil men will hate him, but all will respect him. He is saving men from their selfish selves — as they feel and fear themselves reflected in others; and under him all are sure of justice rather than fickle favors. And he is doomed increasingly to suffer as he imposes justice and administers affairs in the light of the total good, bridging breaches on every hand. Knowledge of God means knowledge of men, power from God means power among men, and fellowship with Christ's sufferings means fellowship with men through suffering. Again and again we are brought to face the same potent truth of the fellowship of moral suffering, born not of the stones and the nails, not of the contumely and scorn of the wicked and the apathy or amusement of the "unco guid," but of the burdens of sorrow carried and the sins vicariously abhorred. By suffering for us and with us Christ redeems us that we, by suffering for and with our fellowmen, may redeem them in all their relationships by His Spirit working in us. The righting of men's sins and of their wrongs is by the same road of moral suffering. To men who are known thus to stand fast in the truth, all instinctively turn to have their wrongs, real or fancied, adjudicated. Significant indeed was the fact that out of the wreck and ruin of a bitter industrial war in Cleveland, precipitated by the street rail-

way strike, when at last a universal demand came for arbitration, each side, unknown to the other, made request of the same man to act for it as arbitrator. That man was the late Glen K. Shurtleff, Secretary of the Cleveland Y. M. C. A., one who had learned that there is

“No glory but in bearing shame,
Nor justice but in taking blame.”

Truly was it said of him: “It was just because he could and did feel deeply, and therefore could see into the real wrongs from which men suffer, that so many resorted to him for decision.” Into that incident and the incisive comment we have added, may be telescoped the whole thought of this paper. The redeemer of individuals and of society, the righter of men’s sins and of their wrongs is not the one who, in his study, spins fine theories and writes specious books about what men need, or ought to need, and paints Utopias which a perfected humanity would enjoy. No man can tell today what El Dorado will be like when we reach it. We shall attain to it step by step as men are regenerated, and as then they (the true redeemers) set about regenerating their brothers and society, fully, by the Spirit of Jesus. In this principle of moral suffering there is both a lamp to light and a fulcrum to lift. There comes a knowledge of what regeneration is needed, and there comes a power to regenerate others in bringing Jesus Christ into the world of the individual and of society today with all the insight and the power which were manifested by Him in Galilee, nineteen hundred years ago.

(2) Our second question was: Who are to lead in this work? We reply emphatically, the Christian ministry, by virtue of the position which it occupies in society. The minister of God is preëminently, what the saviour of society today must be — in the world, but not of it. He is moving among men and is one with them, touching their lives at the critical moments, bearing their sorrows and sharing their joys and abhorring their sins. Yet is He not one of them, but rather stands distant enough from the dust and roar of life’s battle to see “the angel in the sun,” the God-like destiny of a regenerate race, and to hear the still small voice of the Spirit distinguishing for him between good

and evil. He has gained, ideally, the point of view and a knowledge of the needs of men of all classes, rather than of any one class; and he has likewise the point of view of the Eternal, enabling him to see and to sift all the needs of each individual in any class. The minister and the church are parts of the present social order, and have something at stake in it, but less than any other class or institution. For the capitalist to oppose at any mooted point the system which provides him his livelihood, or for the laboring man to champion in any essential feature the system which is robbing him and his family of a fair chance of life and happiness, is rare. The perspective of each is warped and the view-point peculiar. On the other hand, the very *raison d'être* of the minister is by all acknowledged to be ministering to men the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The strange thing is, that for so long, and in so many minds, but one side of that Gospel has been accented in the homeland, whereas on the foreign field the missionary unhesitatingly engages in his two-fold labor — ridding souls of their sins and ridding society of its evils. The minister in Christian lands must realize the ranges and reaches of his Gospel, through the whole individual and the whole of human life. He must absorb all points of view at whatever cost. He must not only attend the business men's banquets, but the labor mass meetings, and the street socialist gatherings. He must find the common moral ground on which they all meet and bring them together there, painfully clearing away whatever obstacles there may be to such at-one-ment.

There is one thing more to be said of the minister's opportunity today. In the light of the conditions touched upon in my second section, we realize that not all the sinners today are lurking in the alleyways or languishing in the jails. They are facing us in the pews of our churches. Here is danger of the gravest breach of all between the masses and the church, when the latter seems to the former to be harboring criminals, men who have robbed them of happiness, and health, and home, they believe, and who yet are posing as examples of the Christian religion. For those smug pharisees the note of individual evangelism is the social note, and for its own sake, to maintain its position of mediatorship in the world, the church must be purged

of them. The naked truth, preached wisely but fearlessly from our pulpits, will either drive out or redeem these men; and then the church can set out unhampered upon its mission of transforming human society into the Kingdom of God on earth. The prophets of every age, who have mightily moved men Godward, have preached this full and virile gospel, and it is for prophets such as they that all times are calling with ceaseless intercession. With them before all others, under God, the hope of the world's redemption rests.

HOWARD ARNOLD WALTER.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—AN INTERPRETATION.

“Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Senate of the State of New Jersey: * May I be pardoned if, upon this occasion, I mention that away back in my childhood, the earliest days of my being able to read, I got hold of a small book . . . Weems’ “Life of Washington.” I remember all the accounts there given of the battlefields and struggles for liberties of the country . . . I recollect thinking then, boy even though I was, that there must have been something more than common that these men struggled for. I am exceedingly anxious that that thing—that something even more than national independence; that something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come—I am exceedingly anxious that this Union, the Constitution, and the liberties of the people shall be perpetuated in accordance with the original idea for which that struggle was made, and I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, His most chosen people, for perpetuating the object of that great struggle.”

There spoke the child of nature, the unschooled lad of the primeval gazing longingly for the first time down the great avenue of human quest and hope, the honest toiler, the soldier, the eager, searching, pondering student, the lawyer, the legislator, the trained reasoner and finished scholar in nature, history, law and government, the foremost statesman of the age, a moral king.

Could we but feel as in his blood all the essence of human life distilled! Could we but see as from his summit of vision the purpose and meaning of the past, and the vast hope of the future! There was lofty conception, profound intuition, a unifying range of sense and vision that comprehended the story of man from the cradle of the race to the “great promise to all the people of the

* From Lincoln’s address at Trenton Feb. 21, 1861.

world, to all time to come." The meaning of the past lay solvent in his mind. The future was before him. He stood for "the last hope of earth," for "millions yet to be." In his grasp of universal meanings, purposes and ends, he was above time, akin to eternity, immortal.

Could we comprehend the meaning of the past, the hope of the future, we might see, in the dawn of history, the early guardians of our human hope, departing from the over-crowded ancestral home-land, bearing the seeds and elements of future civilization, pressed onward to the plains of Western Asia, to the Land of Promise, to the Valley of the Nile, and onward to the Graeco-Roman World, or over the Asian wastes beyond the great rivers and mountains of the vague northern confines, where the unawakened hosts of primitive freemen grew; through all their migrations and habitations, dramatic crises, tragic victories, transforming campaigns, the rise and fall of kingdoms and empires, there runs the epic of freedom.

Within the Caucasian race, modern civilization arises from the blending of three historic elements, the Hebrew, the Graeco-Roman, and the Teutonic. The Land of Promise was the highway and meeting place of the great nations of antiquity. True to the eternal covenant, into the Chosen Race was poured all the lasting wealth of the Ancient East, and her genius was crowned with the living essence of the highest good. But at what a cost was born the blessing to the nations! Her disintegrating masses were scattered and lost in the oblivion of bondage, her rights were forfeited, and her unfaithful remnant rejected the Prince of Peace. Across the sea, Greece had attained the heights in her realm, but the loftiest reach of her mind was a confession of inability to navigate the sea of life alone without some guide sent from God. Rome arose as the organizer, the law-giver, the conqueror and the temporal unifier. Into the coffers of her temples were gathered the hoarded spoils of the ages. But her ancient gods had departed and with them her youth, moral integrity, and power of growth. Her whole being was intoxicated with martial power, her eyes blinded by the blood of battles, her ears deafened by the din of the gory amphitheatre, all her senses deadened with an insane profusion of licentious

luxury. Her soul was sick of the rhetorical philosophy, cynical sophistry and servile sorcery of degenerate impostors. After exhausting all the ways of flesh, she had turned away, hopelessly wrecked and gloomily despondent, from the Old World's almost unconscious quest, "Oh that I knew where I might find Him." Rome could not sense, could not hear or see when the answer to the quest of all the ages came to men — the Way, the Truth and the Light. But a vast, dumb hunger and thirst was calling, waiting for the messengers of the new freedom.

With living need, power of assimilation, capacity for growth, moral integrity and eager enthusiasm the primitive hosts of free-men flooded the dying empire. At the meeting of these mighty torrents, the abyss of destruction seemed to yawn in one vast whirlpool to oblivion. But the elements had found their own. Beyond the mingling a mighty stream flowed westward. And the troubled world took hope.

When, lo! in the remote Eastern deserts a great wave is seen, rising, spreading, deluging, blotting out the ancient nations. "The Crescent, lying in a vast semicircle upon the northern shore of Africa, and the curving coast of Asia, with one horn touching the Bosphorus and the other Gibraltar, seemed about to round to the full and overspread all Europe." In the East the aged Graeco-Roman Power, in a last heroic stand, fulfilled its mission. In the West, the future guardians of freedom, unified in knightly honor by the bonds of their sacred charge, rolled back the bloody, frenzied tide.

The commonwealth of humanity delivered from foes without gave promise of large progress within. Led by the great Teutonic knight, a warrior, reformer, educator, statesman, churchman, the vision of Israel seemed about to dawn. But the free, plastic, unschooled Teutons flowed into the deserted molds of the ancient world. Aristocracies, monarchies and empires were cast. The Church, deserting her true mission, and corporating in the form of the Roman Empire, assumed the ambition to become the temporal ruler of the world. The Papacy and the Empire combined to shackle freedom. The perverted turmoil and the ominous gloom of the Dark Ages were the inevitable result.

The Norman and Saxon freemen combine against a tyrant king, and seal Magna Charta, that sacred pledge of the ancient English civil rights—life, liberty and property. In Germany an honest, intelligent monk is driven to the proclamation and demand for spiritual freedom. And the doom of the Dark Ages breaks in the storm of inquisition, rebellion and revolution.

Far over the seas, on the western horizon, away from greed and strife, a new continent of generous peace and plenty beckoned. On this last mountain of hope, the ark of freedom, bearing the lasting wealth, the selected fruit of the ages, sought a peaceful resting place. The seeds of liberty were sown in the new land. They took deep root and spread over the vast environs of the new home of freedom. A nation of freemen grew.

From the earliest records of the sacred Epic of Freedom the latest guardians drew the form of their first government. To insure "the right use of their liberty," the Pilgrim Fathers "solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civill body politick, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid." There were freemen drawn together for one great end, united in soul and purpose, sealing their bonds in mutual faith and faithfulness with mutual promises, and with no authority for enforcement, save that inherent in the true faithful nature of each—a form from the mold of the Eternal Covenant. Into this form the Colonies grew toward union—the Connecticut Constitution, the New England Confederacy, the Continental Congress. The spirit of freedom had found her own, and already the outlines of her embryo form were appearing.

Beautiful and splendid was her growth. But the eyes of a greedy, licentious and brutal king fell upon her. A long train of abuses of the fundamental human rights followed. Petitions, protests, declarations and appeals were in vain. Government under a despotic king had become destructive of the ends for which governments are instituted. "The laws of nature and of nature's God" entitled the Fathers of the Country to dissolve the bond and to institute a new government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. These "self evident

truths" and "unalienable rights" were the foundations of the Declaration of Independence, "and for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor." Lexington and Concord, Bunker Hill—Yorktown, the blood of the Revolution was the price of these rights.

In the fulness of time the Child of the Ages was born into the family of nations. Conceived of Christian parentage in the ark of civil and religious freedom, she embodied in her being the best elements of the world. The altars of freedom again were raised, that her worship might be in spirit and in truth. From all that was good she drew her form and nourishment.

The Fathers of the Country, true to the mutual pledge of their lives, fortunes and honor, had supported the Declaration through to Independence. Life, Liberty and Property were theirs. How should thirteen colonies live together to preserve and perpetuate that for which they had paid so dearly? From the very nature of man, harmonious relations could not survive in anarchy. Laws must be enunciated and a government instituted. As free-men, what voluntary relations, what form of association should they assume?

The wrecks of the ages were their warning. From all the wisdom and experience of past human life they might select. From the wisdom of the Ancient East, from the treasured wealth of the Hebrews, from Greece, from the Jurisprudence of Rome, the Mediæval Municipalities, the Teutonic representative systems, the experience and social forms of England and her colonies—from the decree and act of God creating all men free and equal, to their own patriotic hearts that beat in response to God's purpose, they drew their philosophy of life, their system of national ethics, the vital principles of their government. Back to the very fountain heads of nature, and of personal relations, they went, that their way might be true. Then we see them following as if by Divine guidance, that path which primitive man, seeking his way through social relations in the morning of history, discovered and blazed through the vast realm of religion, ethics and jurisprudence. It was followed by the an-

cient Chaldæans, Babylonians and Semites, the great way of the Hebrews, extended to Greece, perfected in her communication with all the world by Rome. It has become the great, broad, fixed highway of civilized humanity, the fundamental principle of civil law, from the silent understanding involved in the purchase of a loaf of bread, to the Law of Nations; from the Mayflower Compact, to the Constitution of the United States; from the marriage vows, to the Covenant between God and Abraham. Naturally, historically, the covenant relation appears as that inherent principle in the nature and inevitable life association of free persons, through which they may realize perfect relations in their God-given environment.

Delicate, sacred as a marriage of love, truth, faith, love were required of the persons in a perfect covenant relation. Falseness, faithlessness, greed, bore the doom of mutual suffering and alienation, or else voluntary sharing in the doomed suffering from evil, by the true and faithful one who would not break the covenant. The story of the Eternal Covenant, the sin, the suffering, the price of blood, they knew. And yet solemnly, courageously, naturally, almost inevitably, for the spirit of freedom had already manifested the form she would assume, that sacred covenant relation is entered when "the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice . . . and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." A nation of freemen had found a perfect form of government.

But with the seeds of liberty in the land, the enemy had sown tares. The greed, the curse that had confounded the Old World, had followed to the New. "This trade of importing slaves is dark gloominess hanging over the land," wrote a Quaker in 1745. The Virginia Legislature appealed to the King in 1771: "This trade in slaves is of great inhumanity . . . opposed to our security and happiness . . . a danger to our very existence." "The laws of Impartial Providence may avenge our injustice upon our posterity," wrote Mason to the Virginia Legislature. Washington liberated his slaves. Jefferson branded the slave trade as piracy, and fixed in the Declaration of Independence, that all men

are created equal, with an unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

But the subtle foes of freedom forced into the Constitution, provisions for the legal rights of slavery. One great demand in a covenant relation, in the Kingdom of God, is service — service, not slavery.

From the days when the Cimbri and the Teutons, retreating before the murderous Mongol hordes, appealed to Rome for lands, animally, bodily, almost unconsciously at first, the Teutonic race has lived the demand for the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and property — life, God-given, liberty, God-purposed, property, an environment in which to maintain life and realize liberty.

In slavery the rights of life, liberty, and property were perverted and antagonized. Life, through the destruction of liberty, became property. Morally, naturally, logically, historically and legally slavery was an anomaly, a self contradiction. Right and wrong are “two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. No man can say that you have a right to do wrong.” Magna Charta, the Mayflower Compact, the New England Confederacy, the Declaration of Rights, the Declaration of Independence are records of the struggle for freedom. Slavery is a violation of the fundamental principles of all civil law, and logically can have no legal rights. The Fathers of the Country knew that slavery was wrong, but they yielded in a critical hour for the sake of harmony. They did not know that right could not compromise with wrong. Great principles were set in battle array by men, and men must pay the cost.

The men of the Revolution passed away. A new generation came on. Their hearts were perverted by greed, and their eyes were blinded by the lustre of gold. Slavery was seen “through the thick coating of two billions of dollars.” Slavery is a blessing ordained of God, they said. Their logic, their philosophy, their theology, followed to serve in welding the bonds of the slave. Liberty — Equality — Democracy — Slavery. Was it only an error, inconsistent, self-contradictory? Slavery was the lie of the nation. The house was divided against itself. In the

halls of the new home of freedom sounds of strife arose, brothers exchanging angry speech across the family board, whispering, plotting, trouble, doom in all the chambers. There was no peace. Compromise failed. The house was divided against itself by the inherent evil of slavery.

The Lincolns were of the family. From England, to Massachusetts, to Pennsylvania, to Virginia they came, and then westward; living, experiencing, absorbing, embodying it all. Thankful would we be for a picture of the mother who gave us Lincoln. But she passes on; and we see a tall awkward lad sitting alone on a mother's grave in the great western wilderness, as the gloom of the first dark night comes down—and the empty, lonely days that followed when that sad, far-away look stole into his eyes. She of whom he said: "All that I am, or hope to be, I owe to my Angel Mother," gone so early, and he alone, "gazing down the great avenue of human quest and hope." Again we see him drifting down the great river that flows southward, where a race toils in bondage; at an auction where dark-skinned human beings are sold and led away in chains; always searching, pondering, vowing, struggling upward. Then the echoes of a bloody struggle from the western plains, and the faint rumblings of a coming eruption trouble the whole atmosphere.

A world mission called to the unfathomed depths of that un-found potential life. The appeal of humanity for its fundamental rights is urgent. Duty becomes a passion. All the authority of God's purpose, sleeping in the hearts of freemen, gives power.

But the elements had been mingled. And their operation according to the ordained laws of the universe could not be stayed. The whole atmosphere was charged, the winds were rising, the clouds and the storm were gathering. A strong hand, a clear eye, a true heart was needed at the helm. From all the people he was chosen. Then the storm broke and the warring waves swept the ship of state for many days and many nights. Shaken to her very keel, dismantled, the vessel, strong and true, rode safely through the storm, and "on the bridge, . . . the Captain . . . Dead."

What does it mean?

The life of freedom was again in the balance. From the cradle of the race she had gone the rounds of the Continents, standing, battling all foes without, true to her principles and her honor, but betrayed within; and driven onward, ever onward, by the greed of men. To the last virgin land she had retreated, there to cleanse and recuperate her powers to roll back the tide, and on to the peaceful possession of the world. The sons of liberty rallied to her standard, fought and died in her defense, and vowed their lives and honor to her service. But her ancient enemy, defeated in the open, followed, in the guise of a friend, to strike her heart.

He unmasked the foe, drove him to the open, defined the issue, and captained the conflict. The perversion of law, in violation of the true relation of the fundamental human rights, which created property in life through the destruction of liberty was uprooted from the national government. The Constitution and laws of the United States were restored to their integrity and their true mission of establishing justice and securing the blessings of liberty to mankind.

But freedom cost. The fundamental principles, the honor, the integrity of the Union cost. The evil of slavery cost money, and it cost blood. Sumter — Bull Run, where raw volunteers skirmished and retreated; Gettysburg, where trained veterans grappled and stayed — twenty-three thousand of the Blue fallen, twenty thousand of the Gray — Vicksburg — Chattanooga. They fought on the mountain tops above the clouds, down in the savannahs, from Atlanta to the sea, and on the sea the fleets of iron. They struggled in the wilderness; around Petersburg and Richmond, then Appomatox. The land was drenched, the rivers ran red, the seas were darkened with blood.

The South was ravaged with fire and sword; the property loss inestimable. Three hundred thousand of her sons were dead.

The North had spent thirty-four hundred million dollars. Three hundred and sixty thousand of her sons were dead.

Great principles had been set in battle array by men, and men had paid the cost. Two million six hundred thousand men they marshaled. Six hundred and sixty thousand men were dead.

Independence cost. The Union cost. Freedom cost. It cost blood, and ever will. "There must have been something more than common that those men struggled for . . . something that held out a great promise to all the people of all the world for all time to come."

Through it all he rises, over all he towers, the master spirit of the age. In him we understand our history, our purpose, our hope; and, in his death, our mission. A Captain serving the King of Freedom, "a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty and of this, His most Chosen People"—Abraham Lincoln.

ERIC REECE ALLEN.

A PULPIT PERSONALITY—LYMAN BEECHER

As we study the lives of those men whom down through the ages God has used to transmit the message of eternal life, we cannot fail to be impressed with the varied types of personality through which He works. It is the task of one man to explain the scriptures and what he has seen and heard, and we have a Paul; of another to boldly flame against the corruption and infidelity of his times, and we have a Chrysostom. One man feels he is anointed to preach the Gospel to the poor, and a saintly life is preserved in the memory of time in a St. Francis. The service of one man is passive, mystic, contemplative of the Eternal, and we have an Augustine; of another, aggressive, boldly assertive, aflame with enthusiasm, and we have a Luther; of still another, scholarly, analytical, persuasive, and we have a Bossuet and a Wesley.

These are Old World men but not Old World types. These are characteristics which, alone or blended, in part or in the whole, are to be found in all the great personalities of the pulpit since the name of God was first written in the hearts of men.

Charmed with the story of such lives it was with a sense of exultation that I felt the pulse of a personality of our own nation and even of our section of the country. Lyman Beecher will be remembered as the greatest preacher in one of the most critical periods of our peculiar religious history, as a man who impressed the stamp of righteousness on the conscience of his day, and so imbued his children with the spirit of God as to leave to posterity the most famous family in Christian service in the annals of America. As with all men of a distinctly reconstructive or formative period, Beecher was partly the product of the times, the verbal expression of a widely diffused thought, and partly a "man sent by God" to foster that thought and defend it as his own. He was a man of unusually diverse talents. Let us

watch him as with perfect skill and cool precision he constructs a lawyer-like argument which assails the bulwarks of Unitarianism, or as, upon the platform or in private, with tender accents and eyes often suffused with tears, he tells of the redeeming love of Christ and works upon the hearts of men. Only the crucible of the Almighty could have fused characteristics so different into a personality so positive.

Dr. Beecher's life extended over the whole momentous period between the two great American wars. Born in 1775, the blood of "the Spirit of '76" may be said to have flowed through his veins, while his last low pulse-beat scarcely prevented his aged ear from hearing the echo of the Proclamation of '63. He thus came into an age which displayed as much the passions and the achievements of men as any age has ever done. His father was a poor man, a blacksmith of New Haven. His mother died while he was a baby and he was brought up by an uncle, a farmer. It was while doing a disagreeable piece of work in an unsatisfactory manner on his uncle's farm that at the latter's suggestion, he resolved to obtain an education. His father agreed with his plan and he went to New Haven. Here he studied with various teachers and in 1793, at the age of eighteen, entered Yale College. The college at that time was very small, the equipment poor, instruction worse, and moral tone worst. The students were largely atheists. It was at the beginning of Beecher's third year that Dr. Dwight became president of the college. The latter was the leader of the revival spirit on this side of the Atlantic. He was a good logician and rhetorician. Within a year he had answered all the students' questions in religious matters, cleaned up the atheistic spirit, and substituted a distinctly religious tone. Young Beecher was tremendously impressed by the man, and, encouraged by him, finally formed the idea that he should go into the ministry. He had never had any very deep religious convictions, and had felt that the natural qualities of his mind could be used to best advantage in the law. Yet in answer to what I should term the blind call of God, he decided to preach. After he had made this decision, he was unable to go forward with the zeal and enthusiasm which he desired because he felt his own unworthiness, and, in

fact, doubted his own salvation. His life-long conviction was that "it is true that a deep, genuine work of the Holy Spirit, in revealing to the soul its guilt and lost condition, is and ever must be painful." So that even after he had begun his student preaching he was constantly in despair because of the hardness of his heart toward God, and we find a vivid portrayal of that feeling in his love-letters to the woman who was afterwards to become his wife. His equal solicitude for her eternal welfare, as evidenced, too, in these letters, brings a smile to our faces, as we mark their contrast with the commonly accepted idea of what such letters should be; but they serve to illustrate the earnestness with which Beecher sought to place all things right with God.

His first call came from East Hampton on Long Island. By this time he had found his peace and entered into his work with earnestness and zeal. He himself says of this time that he was "vehement and impulsive," that he "tore a passion to tatters," and in his autobiography quotes from Niles, a student friend, that he was too vehement and flowery and metaphorical. However that may be, he knew how to make an application of his sermons and bring the truth home to his people. His work was blessed in East Hampton and he made many conversions. Almost at the first of his ministry here we learn that eighty were converted and fifty joined the church, while later on a hundred were converted, stirred to action by his sermons on "Election" and the "Government of God Desirable." A hasty survey of this latter sermon reveals its power as an appeal to the reason. Beecher puts his subject into the form of a proposition which he proceeds to analyze and prove in a lawyer-like way. Yet through it all there is that figurative style of language so characteristic of him, that easy manner of saying something in a pleasing way without stepping aside for the mere purpose of employing a beautiful figure, which may well be the envy of us unimaginative souls. These sermons found a wider circle than his immediate parish, for he preached them in New York and "The Government of God Desirable" he had printed. At the end of five years his reputation had grown enough to secure for him a call from Litchfield, Connecticut. Early in his ministry

at East Hampton he had married, and with a growing family he found his salary of four hundred dollars a year inadequate, so that he accepted the new call and transferred his work to a wider and more important field.

At Litchfield he came in touch with men of education who were able to appreciate his intellect and logic. Litchfield was at that time noted for its able lawyers, doctors, and teachers. Young men from various parts of the country and occasionally from the Old World flocked here to be taught of such men as Judge Gould and Judge Reeve. This was the kind of a congregation for Beecher, and noble and scholarly were the thoughts that flowed from his pen and heart. Yet I would not have you think that he sacrificed to literature and the love of the æsthetic the nobler sentiments of the soul. Dearer to him was the approval of God than the admiration of men, yet he won the commendation of both. He preached revival to a congregation which hated revivals, which had been reported to have "voted Christ out of their borders," he prophesied and he prayed for revival, and it came. The humblest and the proudest of his congregation heard through him the voice of the Almighty, and hearing gave heed. He was always careful not to arouse a religious excitement which would bring on a reaction, so that his revival work was spread over the whole sixteen years of his pastorate and gave to the church a healthful, steady growth. While here Beecher became interested in temperance, and it was in 1812 that at a General Assembly, as chairman of a committee, he drew up a report which he claimed in his autobiography was the most important paper he ever wrote. In this report he rehearsed the evils of prevailing intemperance and made some practical suggestions for working against them. We can all recall from our general knowledge of history how common was the use of liquor in those days. The autobiography gives us as an illustration an account of a minister's ordination which Beecher attended. "And the sideboard, with the spilling of water, and sugar, and liquor, looked and smelled like the bar of a very active grog-shop. None of the Consociation were drunk; but that there was not at times a considerable amount of exhilaration, I cannot affirm." The Assembly followed

Beecher's suggestions with far reaching results for good. "This report stands among the earliest documents of the great Temperance Reformation," and deserves study by any one interested in the subject and its history.

Beecher's reputation was now widely extended and he was everywhere regarded as a man of unusual depth and power. He was often called upon to visit other places on special occasions and had flattering invitations to fill other pulpits. It was of interest to me to find an account of a visit to Hartford at this time to help in revival work here. During these years at Litchfield he preached often nine times a week and frequently assisted neighboring churches in revival work. His desire was to pass his life in this particular field, and doubtless he would have done so but for the need of a larger salary to support his family. Some of his children were at school and college and required more assistance than could be afforded by so meager a salary. So in 1826 he accepted the pastorate in Hanover Street Church in Boston.

There was more than one reason for his being called to this church. He was well known as a revivalist. He was able and willing as an orthodox Presbyterian to take up the defense of Calvinism against the movement of the Unitarians. He was in the prime of life, a man well seasoned in thought, and willing if necessary to oppose a heresy which "was from the first as a fire in his veins."

When he first began to preach in his new church people flocked to listen to him, expecting to hear the thunder and the earthquake. They heard nothing of the sort. "I began with prudence," says Beecher, "because a minister, however well known at home, and however wise and successful he *has* been, has to make himself a character anew, and find out what material is around him. . . . I made no attack on Unitarians, I carried the state of revival feeling I had had at Litchfield for years." It warms the soul to read Beecher's own account of these times and all should do so who are interested in revival methods. "Fifteen the first week at the inquiry meeting, twenty the second, thirty-five the third, and the fourth time three hundred." People from all classes and walks in life came

to him for help. He was able with equal ease to give words of comfort which soothed the despondent, or arguments which settled the doubts of the skeptic. "When the two gentlemen came on to see me, I took them into my inquiry room. There was great variety of cases. Language of simplicity came along, and they'd see me talking way down in language fit for children, and then, the next moment, rise into clear, strong, philosophical language. And then the language of free agency and ability came along, and then they told me afterward, they thought I was going to be a — what d'ye call it? — Arminian, and they'd stick up their ears. I *made something* of free agency — more than a Calvinist would do usually and brought folks up to *do* what they were able to. But next minute came along the plea of morality and self-dependence, and I took them by the nape of the neck and twisted their neck off. So they saw that I had my replies according to the nature of the subject, and in the course of the evening heard me touch on seven or eight or more different states of mind."

Beecher's notable work here was the defense of Calvinism in its struggle against Unitarianism. The Unitarian Church had in its membership all of the educated and literary men of the community. Calvinism was a despised sect. Nearly all the pulpits of fashion were filled by Unitarian preachers. "All the trustees and professors of Harvard College were Unitarians. Old foundations, established by the Pilgrim Fathers . . . for teaching their own views . . . were seized upon for the support of opposing views. A fund for preaching an annual lecture on the Trinity was employed for preaching an attack upon it."

The Unitarians were not unaware of Beecher's meetings. People began to leave their own church and go to them. Many were there converted. Others ridiculed Beecher and his work, forbade their wives and children to attend his meetings, and spent all their influence with the press, politics, and society, to injure the movement. So Beecher was gradually forced into a definite defense of Calvinism and we find him at work on a periodical, "The Spirit of the Pilgrims." Here the doctrines of his faith were carefully explained and the work of the

orthodox church recorded and forwarded. He entered into a discussion on Infant Salvation, showing that his opponents were wrong when they claimed that the Calvinists believed in damnation of such. He delivered and published a course of "Lectures on Political Atheism." Let me quote from one of these lectures to give some indication of his vigor. After having given a list of the misjudgments commonly imputed to Calvinism, he says, "It is needless to say that falsehoods more absolute and entire were never stereotyped in the foundry of the Father of Lies, or with greater industry worked off for gratuitous distribution from age to age."

There was fire in all his talk and the Unitarians quailed under it. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, hailed his support with delight. Orthodox churches increased in prestige and power and exulted in the consciousness of a deliverer. I do not wish to leave the impression that Beecher's natural inclination lay along the line of polemics. Haywood, in his biography, speaks of Beecher's belligerent tone in writings and addresses and says that "nothing was too bitter for him to say against the offending sect"; that "he failed utterly to see that, with all their limitations, these people were at least honest." My opinion is that Haywood is mistaken here and that Beecher took a very fair position under the circumstances. I think that if he could have done as he wished, he would have devoted little time to actual controversy and have been content to have kept on with revival work which was so dear to him. He was forced into the arena by the need of his times, because he was fitted to take up the work and he did it well. Unfortunately complete success was denied him; for at a time when all bid fair for a victory for Calvinism, a difficulty arose in their own ranks. In the effort to clearly define their doctrine they stated that "God governs the universe by motive and not by force." Many of them "did not come up to this position fair and square." A controversy arose which occupied the attention of "The Spirit of the Pilgrims" to the exclusion of Unitarianism, and divided the friendly ranks. Involved in a new discussion, Beecher kept up the double struggle and brought into play his splendid powers of clear-headed argument, striving to unite his brethren, preserve

the unbroken crest of orthodoxy, and oppose all the attacks of Unitarianism. The differences which arose in the Presbyterian Church were never settled and were a part of the movement which resulted in the New School. Of this we shall speak later in another connection.

Meanwhile Beecher was busy in other lines of work. The revivals were still going on, the inquiry room was still demanding his attention. Then, too, Beecher was interesting himself in young men, and several societies for political and social betterment took form under his fostering care and achieved splendid results. Nor ought we longer to neglect to take a glimpse into his home life and see the great man as he was in his family at this time. His daughter, later Mrs. Stowe, writes charmingly of this life. Dr. Beecher was so busily occupied during the week that it was only of a Sunday night that he might be sure to be free from care. After the evening service he would return home and allow himself "to run down." Out came his old fiddle and he would play a merry tune such as "Money Musk" and "Go to the Devil and Shake Yourself:" the children sang and even the little ones were allowed to stay up beyond the wonted hour and enjoy their father's company. If the mother retired before the rest, Beecher, in his stocking-feet, could sometimes be persuaded to execute a double-shuffle as he used to do as a boy on the barn floor at corn huskings.

Perfect freedom of speech was allowed in his household. If one of the children held a point of view different from his own, he encouraged him to defend it and would often give a hint of helpfulness to aid the feebler argument. Only in one particular was he severe; he would allow no one to use sophistical or false reasoning. The whole argument must be above board and legitimate. He encouraged the quip, the jest and sharp retort and would never allow one member of the family to show anger to another on account of it. In later years his famous sons and daughters, Charles, Edward, Thomas, and Henry, Catherine, Isabella, and Harriet, reaped rich blessings from such splendid intellectual training in argument and witty turn. It was an education to breathe the atmosphere of such a home. Beecher's prayers were one of his most effective ways of touching the

heart. Usually in the home they were very simple petitions, but as the flood of revival swept about his doors, his soul was filled with exultation and heavenly enthusiasm, and the prayers that went up from that home at this time were a very exaltation and must have beaten with irresistible force against the very throne of the Most High.

And now I have to speak of that which fills us with amazement. It is the sober thread woven throughout the whole web of his career, tracing which I was led into many a secret of his life and power. This man of power, with his "gold-nugget thoughts" and intense energy, suffered all his life from severe nervous troubles; nine months at East Hampton unable to preach, months at Litchfield, forced into travel while at Boston, crying "I shall die if you do not give me relief," often despondent, yet ever faithfully, in decline or recovery, working to reach the "mark of the high calling."

The Emmanuel movement is not the first attempt of an orthodox ministry to aid the spiritual through the physical, or vice versa. Taught by his own experience, Beecher was led to perceive the need of a "clinical theology," as he called it. Many a despairing penitent was surprised on consultation with him in regard to "their state" at being met with questions in regard to diet and exercise. We will not, I think, do injustice to him or his method if we imagine a conversation between him and some sensitive soul. "Do you believe, doctor, that such as I are destined to eternal damnation?" (Notice the touch of Calvinism.) "What did you eat for breakfast?" "What shall I do if I am not elected?" "Take a walk before breakfast and don't go to church for a month." The fact is that Dr. Beecher differentiated between "Lachrymal religion" and dyspepsia when neither was well understood.

For his own use he kept in his back yard parallel bars, single bar, ladder, and so on, in order to work off nervous strain. When the weather was particularly bad or the strain acute he would rush to the cellar where he always kept a load of sand: here he would set industriously to work and shovel the sand all over to one side of the cellar, after which he would shovel it back again. We might multiply incidents of his effort to recover nervous control, his farming enterprises, etc., but these

are sufficient to draw the lesson of difficulties overcome by a singleness of purpose in Christian service and a will indomitable.

His reputation as an organizer, revivalist, and defender of the faith flowed westward and he was recognized throughout the country as the greatest divine of his day. A flattering call came to him from a Philadelphia church, but he was firmly resolved not to leave his Boston parish.

In 1830 he received an invitation to become president of Lane Seminary in Ohio. He was much interested in the attempt to build up the seminary but declined the position because he was busy with his people in building a church, the one on Hanover Street having burned down. Two years later he was prepared to refuse the same position because he felt he was needed at that time in Boston by the Presbyterian Church as a denomination. But the appeal was urgent and his belief was strong in the need for the west of such a seminary as this proposed to be, so he finally accepted the call. In 1832 the scene of his labors was transferred to Walnut Hills, just out of Cincinnati, and here he took up the work which occupied the last twenty years of his active life.

The only equipment the seminary had at this time was a charter, sixty acres of land, and an endowment of \$6,000. As soon as it was known that Dr. Beecher was to fill the presidential chair \$60,000 to \$70,000 were pledged for the seminary's support. Beecher insisted that he should maintain the position of pastor as well as teacher, both for the good of the students and for his own intellectual growth. He secured the pastorate of one of the neighboring churches, Second Church, which he filled for thirteen years. During these years he did an incredible amount of work, raised funds for the support of the seminary, attended to the administrative work of the institution, lectured to students, preached at the church and conversed with the regenerate. The fact that he was in charge of the seminary gave stability and character to its affairs and brought financial aid from east and west. The classes were large and in a couple of years things were in a flourishing condition. It was in the third year of Dr. Beecher's work here that an event occurred which nearly ruined the prospects of the institution.

It was still thirty years before the great War of the Rebellion, but the question of slavery and anti-slavery was a lively one, full of heat and occasional flashes of lightning. Young enthusiasts in our northern universities were frequently gathered together in anti-slavery clubs. Such a club existed at Lane. The faculty were not unsympathetic, but wisely restrained excessive zeal on the part of the club. It was looked upon, however, with disfavor by the trustees and, in 1834, during the temporary absence of Dr. Beecher, they passed a vote prohibiting all such clubs in the institution. In spite of Dr. Beecher's efforts to settle matters satisfactorily, the students left in a body. This was a fearful blow to the seminary. It was not only now without students, but was receiving unfavorable comments from the press as a "Bastile of oppression—a spiritual inquisition"—comments which made the prospects of getting new students well nigh hopeless. Many thought that Dr. Beecher would leave under these conditions, for he was out of sympathy with the trustees, and even the eye of a prophet might have seen it a part of wisdom to give up so unpromising a work and return to the pulpit. But he was of too sanguine and buoyant a nature to see defeat, and surrender under such circumstances. He went to work to obtain other pupils. His life here was a constant struggle against difficulties such as these: the classes were small (averaging only five a year for the next four years), some professors gave up in discouragement, and not enough money came in to pay his own salary.

It was in the midst of these earlier difficulties that there arose his famous trial, in which Dr. Wilson, a member of his church, strove to show that Beecher was unsound in the faith and so unfit for his position. This trial has been of great interest to me and I would like to have presented it quite fully had I the time. It was really a struggle between the Old School and the New, between absolutism and moral government. The points of difference are rather bewildering and, in fact, the disputants themselves were not always sure of them. In general the Old School stuck close to the principle of predestination, while the New School went farther than the Confession of Faith, which blends the two thoughts into an *in*harmonious whole, and

laid stress on the freedom of the will. Beecher's strong belief in the compassion and mercy of a loving Father led him in more than one discourse to mitigate the harshness of strict Old School Calvinism, as we have noted in the case of his work on "Infant Salvation" and in his inquiry meeting, and he thus, though unidentified with the New School, was, by Dr. Wilson, brought into the controversy in such a way as to be forced to defend it. Beecher tried in all gentleness and honor to avoid the conflict, but, being forced, he went into it with his usual clear-sighted, lawyer-like skill. He was a far greater man than Dr. Wilson and had more intelligent support. Wilson lost his case in every court from first to last, while at each trial Beecher was allowed to present his interpretation of the Confession and give expression to his views of orthodoxy, views which seem to be far up to the common sense of our day. (So far as I can see, he came mighty near being a Congregationalist, and if that isn't common-sense, what is?)

For twenty years Beecher kept faithfully at his post in the seminary, resigning in turn his pastorate of the Second Church, his professorship of theology, and, in 1851, the presidency. How many a man he had inflamed here among the divinity students with the eternal fire of the Living Word is written only in the Lamb's Book of Life.

From Cincinnati he went to Maine, Boston, and Brooklyn in turn, to visit his friends and his children. In the last place he made his home near his son, Henry, until his death. We gladly pass over the last few years of his life, for, worn by age and a career of such nervous energy, his mental vision became clouded and with the old passionate love for public service he was yet constrained to go his way "sermonless and sorrowful" to the end.

We have studied the *history* of the man, but we are as yet unacquainted with all the richness of his personality. What were some of his characteristics? He was a man of medium height and breadth, and of muscular frame. His features were of a Roman cast, intellectual and genial, capable of expressing emotion, yet easily set into lines of decision and sternness. An earnestness and intensity in the pulpit made up for a lack in rich-

ness of tone, for he had no "liquid rotundity" of voice, no pleasing registers.

His expressions were often terse, bordering sometimes on rudeness. Yet I do not wish it to be understood that he did not have beauty of diction; his figurative expressions are to me a source of envy. His portrayals were very vivid. At one time he preached a descriptive sermon of Mary at Jesus' feet, and before he was through his audience and he himself were in tears. As we read this incident in connection with Beecher, we recall of him the words of Virgil,

"Sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt."

In his autobiography he says, "The soul of eloquence is feeling, and in the ministry *holy* feeling." Such emotions as he showed in the pulpit were but reflections of the compassion of the Almighty. We may get a further idea of how he affected his hearers from an account of one of his revival meetings. "I went and preached. I saw one young man with his head down. I wanted to know if it was an arrow of the Almighty. I came along after sermon and laid my hand upon his head. He lifted his face, his eyes all full of tears; I saw it was God."

Dr. Beecher had an invariable habit of casting his sermons into two parts, a "statement and argument addressed purely to the understanding and a passionate and direct appeal to urge the audience to some practical result." Dr. Dwight says of him that "his strength lay in putting things, in driving." His sudden changes of thought often brought a smile; he was naturally of a humorous turn, but blended the humorous with the serious in such a way as not to detract from the general effect.

His keen insight into affairs is well illustrated in a letter to a young minister in which he gives advice of lasting value. "On the whole, I remark, it is a *common thing, almost universal*, for a person newly settled to get discouraged and run low somewhere about the close of the second year. Some break down. Others work up their ideas, and grow discouraged and lazy, preach hasty, extempore sermons, neglect study, and are either dismissed, or, living through and seeing the danger, begin to rise and grow. And this has been the turning point with many a man."

His brief proverbial sayings, according to one doctor of divinity, have been more commonly quoted in private and public life than those of any other American save Benjamin Franklin. Men repeated them even more for their wisdom than for the wit which they contained. Three quotations must suffice here. "Eloquence is logic set afire." "The soul in the body is enclosed within mud walls through the chinks of which the brilliant light of the soul shines." "Walking is *not* the best form of exercise for students: you don't *think* with your *legs*."

Beecher was loved not only by his congregation, but by his colleagues in the ministry as well. His deference to their opinions and his own deep love for them won for him their respect and affection. His daughter in speaking of this affection for them, says, "His friendships were constant and imperishable, passing the love of woman." Similar indeed to the impression he made on the men of his time is that he had made on the mind of at least one young man of the present day.

A great life is a volume of apothegms, each of which may itself be elaborated into a volume or find its expression in a thousand lives lived long after its author has passed through the portals of the unknown. The personality of Beecher is not like a deep and placid pool by whose side men once stood to admire its depth and beauty, but which at length has oozed away, leaving only a parched and arid land: it is more like the inexhaustible fountain of the rain clouds sprinkling its inspiration down through the vistas of time into the hearts and minds of men.

FENWICKE LINDSAY HOLMES.

THE CALL OF GOD IN RELATION TO PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

Disbelief is as natural as belief; and from their fusion blossoms religion. Both combine in faith, and under its guidance a man seeks his God. A man has to reject as well as to accept, and according to his wisdom in this judgment is his capacity for a closer union with the Divine Will. He must choose well if he would know well what his God would have him do and how live.

But how much lies in his capacity for choice, which we call free-will? and how great are the influences that mould that capacity while yet it is mobile and childlike? A man, a modern man, let us suppose, is born into a Christian family. From his earliest years he knows of Christ; the church is a most familiar place. He attends the Sunday-school and Bible-class. He hears his parson preach once a week, at least. At school he studies his Bible or rather regards it as a lesson much like other lessons which he must of necessity learn. The study is desultory, the preaching often worse; and no one seems to feel the need of impressing upon the boy the great, undoubted truth that this Sunday behavior which he finds so irksome, is one of the greatest, nay, the very greatest of his life's problems, and a factor in the hewing of his character than which none other shapes his destiny so strongly.

He is frankly a pagan during these school-days with lapses into Christianity at intervals. Once a week he dresses and feels all the importance of black clothes—and their boredom. He sings hymns heartily, because he enjoys singing. While the parson prays and preaches, his soul is wandering over the playing fields, or browsing with the poets and novelists he has learned to love. This religion is not real for him. It is not made real. It is preached in terms he cannot understand, and

perhaps would not like if he could. It is external to his scheme of life, his philosophy of living. It is shut up in churches and dressed in black. None of the great, boyish qualities of Christianity are shown to him, its love of freedom, its eager, brave courage, its manly resolution, its pursuit of perfection.

At home the ideals of Christianity are practiced to the extent of his parents' ability to know and achieve them. But the boy is not a philosopher; and is unable to search and dive deep down for first causes. His father is a decent fellow because he is decent. His mother is good because she is gentle and kind and forgiving. The boy is not dunned and besieged with the idea that because of Christ's life and death and sacrifice, because of His teaching and humanity, He led men back to the Father, and through love compels them to live pure lives and enjoy sacrifice that all may enter the Kingdom of Christ in God.

The supreme irony of the boy's life is this, that while this religion is thrust upon him, and clings loose and misfitting to his knowledge and experience, gradually and scientifically all the other branches of his intellectual and practical training for life are dovetailed together in a system, and this, the keystone of it all, is strange to him and has no place in his consciousness.

College re-echoes the forlorn song of boyhood. It is the same tale in a higher pitch of intensity. The young man goes far and fares well in literature and history and the classics. Then philosophy swims into his ken; and either it makes him think or he is a "fusionless" member of society for life, doing good, perhaps, but believing nothing thoroughly and well.

But what of him who thinks? How does he win out? Well: some there are whose former loose faith is blasted. Its isolation, its splendid isolation, is no support for it in the day of strenuous thought. It falls because it has never been related to the man's works and thoughts and passions and desires. It fails to hold its ground because it has no firm principle grappling it to all the other fundamental thoughts and experiences of life. Hitherto, it has been a second existence which a man entered when it was required for respectability, a subconscious element, as a modern psychologist would explain, which occasionally over-leaped the threshold of consciousness. Now it sinks for-

ever into the vast abyss of the unbelievable and all things are weary, flat, stale and unprofitable to the soul.

To others, deep down in their being, speaks the conviction that if they will only think, light will come. They have a twilight sense of some connection between what they know and what has been for them mere hearsay. They feel that

"Many a green isle needs must lie
In the deep wide sea of misery."

They turn abroad from the scholastic fields of their youth. They enter the lists of the world. They penetrate beneath the veil of the filth and misery of the slums; they pierce the glitter of the demi-monde; they read and think and

"Welcome each rebuff
That turns earth's smoothness rough,
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand—but go."

They take three parts pain for joy. They strive and hold the strain cheap. They learn and account not their pangs when old and charmed things must fall because they are not true. They dare to look at God's face, to find Him as He is revealed in His works and words to men, in nature, in the stars, and in the whole wide universe of things and thoughts. They struggle on through doubts and misbeliefs. One idea of God after another colors their conviction. Plato yields his quota and Kant freely gives his. Berkeley holds a wavering loyalty, Socrates stands a grand figure, a very Christian pagan, lovable and desirable, approaching nearer than almost any since, the ideal of the Master.

So all give their help in this conquest of the soul. Gradually the whole wide-scattered material coalesces and is fused into one great, sublime idea. One Spirit, one ideal, one transcending sight unifies the lot. God is seen in and through the soul. His workings are there made manifest. Christ's life and death and sacrifice are vouched for by its experiences. It beholds the nobility of men and their divinity of approach to the world. It bows to God in Christ made manifest, to Christ the incarnation of God, proven by His wondrous works and words which for all time satisfy and shall satisfy the needs of men. Then

"Every sight
And sound from the vast earth and ambient air
Sends to his heart its choicest impulses."

Then "all of great, or good, or lovely which the sacred past, in truth or fable, consecrates, 'he feels and knows';" and

"The awful shadow of some unseen power
Floats though unseen amongst us — visiting."

He has fought the fight, this man, and won, as all brave men will. Paul at last faced the facts fairly and thought them out bravely. His birth, his life, his training, his teaching, even his religion, were all hostile to the new factor that had entered his experience. Yet they were all subdued by it, won by it and forced through love and reverence and unspeakable humility to its side, to work for it and use their very powers to achieve its ends.

Paul knew the wants and needs of his fellows. He knew their obstacles and stumbling-blocks, and now he knew the remedy. He understood both sides and was fitted to minister to men. He was called of God. A divine necessity impelled him, a great conviction that he knew what other men needed to know, wrought upon him so that he went forth and said to all the world: "This was Christ crucified; he died that we might live!"

And so the man of today, with his training and education. He wins his way through a certain course to light; and the impulse comes to him to go out and tell other men how they, filled with his fears and doubts, distracted as he was distracted with unrelated patches of knowledge and experience, may find the peace that comes through Christ in the great understanding of God's ways and God's love; he points to God and from the fulness of his experience says:

"The one remains, the many change and pass;
Heaven's light forever shines, earth's shadows flee,"

and vows to dedicate his powers to Christ forever.

WILLIAM THOMSON.

In the Book-World

THE JACOBUS AND THE HASTINGS BIBLE DICTIONARIES.

These two admirable single volume Bible dictionaries enter the field at the same time as open rivals for popular favor. If it were a mere question of looks the choice would be easy. The Jacobus (The Standard), in spite of its somber marbling, its imitation back and its ugly but useful thumb holes, is a far handsomer book than the Hastings. As regards shape, type, typographical disposition and variety, margins, illustrations and maps, the Jacobus is a model of taste and suitability beside which the small type, unleaded lines, scant and mediocre illustrations, and margins too wide for the condensed typography of the Hastings seem distinctly commonplace.

But the competition between these two excellent books is of working value rather than of looks. On this line, too, the Jacobus scores again at the very start with its illustrations. These are not only so delightful in execution as to make it a real pleasure and education to look the book through from beginning to end, but they are chosen and adapted for use with such excellent judgment as to form a masterpiece in a field where careless and meaningless work is the rule. For Sunday-school work the illustrations alone, although by no means excessive and hardly even to be described as profuse, are certainly worth the whole cost of the volume. Other unique features of the Jacobus are the pronunciations (one of the most clearly realized wants of many users) and the very well chosen select bibliographies.

When it comes to the substance of the letterpress work a comparison of the two books is much more balanced. In actual scholarship there is little to choose and the level of both is very high. Hastings has a larger number of contributors, but the

A STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY. Edited by Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., Chairman of the editorial board, Edward E. Nourse, D.D., and Andrew C. Zenos, D.D. Funk & Wagnalls Co., pp. 920. \$6.00.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, edited by James Hastings, D.D., with coöperation of John A. Selbie, D.D., and the association of John C. Lambert, D.D., and of Shailer Mathews, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 500. \$5.00.

smaller faculty of Jacobus is unimpeachable and perhaps results in a little more coherence and unity — and after all, thirty-seven authors to one volume, stout as the volume is, does not sound like overburdening the writers. The Jacobus book is certainly more consistent, more painstaking, better proportioned on the whole and more uniform in method, but this probably concerns the general editing rather than the larger or smaller body of contributors, and the proportioning is occasionally as much below the just level of assignment in Jacobus as it is often above in Hastings. Hastings, e. g., devotes perhaps three per cent. of the whole book to Versions! In the matter of ancient versions Jacobus has a just proportion, where Hastings is excessive and repetitious, but in the case of English versions, although Hastings gives to these the immense and very unnecessary amount of twenty-two columns, Jacobus errs almost as far in the other direction. Testing first the two at points most familiar to the present reviewer the articles on Writing in Hastings and Alphabet in Jacobus break about even in the matter of distinction. Each has quality. The Jacobus (Sterrett) article on Books and Writing is a good epitome of material palæography but quite without distinction or peculiar usefulness, and one fails to find any mention of libraries under any heading to compare with the excellent little paragraph in the Hastings article on Writing. Hastings, on the other hand, shows characteristic disproportionateness in the long article on Papyri and Ostraka — as excellent, to be sure, as it is disproportionate but quite out of place in a one-volume dictionary. The articles on the Text of the Old and New Testament, by Paton and von Dobschütz, in Jacobus; Gray and Kenyon, in Hastings, are all adequate in scholarship. The latter are allowed more space to develop their themes and introduce more detail, but the Jacobus articles, on the other hand, are models of restrained composition. While in the N. T. Jacobus is perhaps too restrained and rather owed it to the public to save space for notice of the most famous MSS., there is no qualification to be made as to the Paton article which, like most of the Paton articles, is a model of scholarship refined to an uncommon perfection, restrained to the most salient facts and organized and displayed in the most practical fashion. The articles of G. B. Gray are among the best in Hastings and always have distinction but they are not better than Paton's. Among other words connected with the history or the philosophy of books such as Tablet, Debir, Nebo, Logos, Holy Spirit, etc., there is also little choice in scholarship or execution. Hastings scores, however, in the inclusion of an excellent little article on Gesture.

A running examination of some scores of random articles in all classes fails to show any very tangible difference in quality save in geography and antiquities. In these there is a little difference. While the competency of McAlister cannot be questioned for a moment or the absolute value of his articles, Jacobus (Guthe) on Palestine, is one of the most appropriate articles in either work, Paton, on Jerusalem, is an unusual article, the articles on Geography and Ethnology are unique to Jacobus and admirable, and these things together with the more excellent maps and illustrations make a total not more able in scholarship but distinctly better for use.

An analysis of the first 200 or so titles shows that there are some forty odd articles in Hastings which are not in Jacobus and eleven in Jacobus which are not in Hastings. Many of these uniques are cross references and most of those in Hastings are references to the apocrypha of the Old Testament or version words such as Ability, Acceptance, Access, Adoration, Agony, etc. Outside of these classes Hastings has an article on Adonis, and an excellent one by Gray on Acrostic, while Jacobus has useful articles on Adversary, the Books of Adam, Abi and Ah. It is hard to generalize about the unique articles because often the same material is found under different captions. Each one has a goodly number of excellent uniques such as the ones on Semitic Religion, on Ethnography and Geography, in Jacobus, and sundry articles on Versions, various articles extracted from the general article on Jesus Christ, such as Incarnation and Person of Christ, and the like, in Hastings.

It is as regards theological tendency that these books will be generally examined with most interest. Both of them try to take the middle way. Both accept very definitely the documentary hypothesis and a late dating for the present forms of many of the Old Testament books and both take pains to make it entirely clear at least by the complete summary of objections to the hitherto accepted positions that they are quite in touch with the latest that has been asserted in these matters. Both books are conservative at points compared with the most radical positions, as, for example, those of Cheyne. The Cheyne Encyclopedia holds, or implies, as to gospel miracles that they never happened at all or if they did they were not miraculous; as to the resurrection of Christ, that it was not a fact and probably the witnesses to it were the victims of subjective visions; as to the gospel story itself that, even in its most historic versions, it is not pure truth but truth mixed with doubtful legend, and that the theory of the Virgin birth came into being at a late date under Gentile influ-

ences. Jacobus and Hastings on all these critical points can practically speak either for the other: As to the Virgin Birth, Hastings (Grierson) and Jacobus (Zenos) alike hold in the words of Grierson, that the early idea of the Virgin Birth "can be reasonably accounted for only by the occurrence of the fact itself." As for miracles, Sanday, in Jacobus, speaks for both books when he says "That miracles were performed by Christ . . . this he regards as certain." Again as for the resurrection both can agree in the words of Hastings (Paterson) who finds "The historical testimony sufficient to guarantee the credibility of the central fact." And finally, as to the Gospel histories themselves, Maclean, in Hastings, holds them to be "trustworthy records whose writers had first hand authority for what they state," and Denney, in Jacobus, "strictly historical testimony." These departures from the most radical positions are quite characteristic of the common mediate position of both.

In many cases too where both fall away from the more conservative position they are not far apart, and neither radical nor conservative would find much to choose between them in either direction so far as actual position is concerned. This is true as to the analysis of the documents of the Hexateuch, the view of the book of Esther and many other matters. There is, however, in Jacobus, in these circumstances, a guardedness in things doubtful, a certain suavity and considerateness for the feelings of those who are so unfortunate as not to be High Critical enough for their own standards, which is often lacking in Hastings. In the many documentary discussions of the Old Testament books, for example, there is much said about "tradition" in Jacobus, but the work is much less freely studded with "legend," "myth," "not history in a strict sense" and the like expressions offensive to the old-fashioned, and its style is far less dependent on such phrases as "no competent scholar would assert" or "proves beyond doubt," to assert its feeling of confidence in disputed matters. A good example of the more guarded and adroit use of terms in Jacobus is in the matter of "tradition." Hastings is quite unrestrained in his use of "oral tradition" for an "indefinite period" and J or E first committed to writing in the century before 750. Jacobus (Nourse) on the other hand, while he uses "tradition" freely, notes a few possible recorded documents and looks on J or E both as collections of earlier documents, though without committing himself either way as to whether they are oral or written, and finally when it comes to the origin of all the series, sticks in general to the word "popular" instead of "oral," although he does imply oral transmission for some time at the beginning and "incidental embellishment."

One cannot venture to say "that no competent scholar" can hold to the oral transmission of documents such as these two groups which scholars have analyzed out, for Skinner and the rest are very competent scholars indeed. All that one may say, therefore, is that these men appear to one whose scholarship, such as it is, is literary and palæographical, as wholly in the wrong; that no parallel sets of documents so much alike as the forms they set before us in the parallel passages of J and E could have survived so long without even greater variation of text (except, perhaps, in the case of poetical documents), save by means of carefully organized schools of oral transmission such as those of ancient India, and that there is not only no evidence of such schools among either priests or prophets but that in a land surrounded by and filled with document reading people they would be inconceivable save perhaps in brief-lived and local cases. On the other hand there is absolutely no palæographical ground why there may not have been collections of written documents and collections of collections extending back to the neighborhood of the alleged times of the alleged events, even if the Hebrews were nomad tribes from Arabia. For the theory of oral transmission to the century before 750, one must assume not only a natural but a wilful and incredible illiteracy on the part of the Hebrews, for which there is, to say the least, no evidence. This is especially true of a notion that J and E are collections of edited collections—who can believe in collections of folk-tales edited and edited again orally? Jacobus is here in fact only a step in advance of Hastings, but he saves the whole logical situation by a careful use of terms avoiding dubious assumptions and yet with equal care not to deny the oral hypothesis. It is sound method as well as clever and proper use of language.

In some cases, however, where both books depart from the most conservative position, one faces a little towards the conservative and the other a little toward the radical. Choosing more or less at random an article to compare Jacobus and Hastings on the one hand, with a late avowed conservative statement of the first class on the other, Genesis yields the following: Jacob, in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, says: "Genesis is a historical work . . . a well planned and well executed composition of a single writer . . . a uniform work without contradictions . . . anachronisms . . . or useless repetitions." Skinner, in Hastings, says that "the contents of Genesis are not historical in the technical sense." Nourse, in Jacobus, sums up by saying "that a great part of the substratum of the traditions in Genesis is historical, seems to be a reasonable posi-

tion." As to inspiration: in Hastings (Garvie), men are "in various degrees" enlightened by the Holy Spirit; in Jacobus (Zenos), "authors of the Old Testament and the New Testament" count their power "unique either in kind or degree." The shading of Hastings towards the inspiration of all believers is definite if not explicit, while the attitude of Jacobus toward the unique inspiration of biblical writers is both definite and explicit, although it puts the responsibility for the statement on the writers themselves. The articles on the Song of Songs also, perhaps, belong in this class. Hastings (Taylor) regrets that the "folk songs" here brought together "dwell only on the physical excellences of the beloved," finds the imagery too "luscious" and "should indeed have been glad to find some recognition of the loftier side of marriage," where Jacobus (Leary), on the other hand, finds it a "glorification of true love," an ideal of "pure and faithful love between one man and one woman" or, under the caption "Love" (Jacobus — Zenos) it is the ideal of human love "in its full strength and purity."

In brief, Jacobus and Hastings are practically on a par as to scholarship and critical position, but Jacobus is a little more cautious toward the radical and more considerate of the orthodox. Hastings has a little more matter but Jacobus excels in unity and proportioning of editing, sense of his public, suavity of style, illustrations and mechanical detail.

These two books, though both international to some degree in authorship, yet in effect represent the best product, the one of British, the other of American scholarship. It may be national predilection in both cases, but as an American cannot escape the feeling that the American Revision of the Bible is better than the English, so he cannot help feeling that the American Bible Dictionary is really a trifle better than the English, even in scholarship. In Bible learning America has at least achieved a new independence. It is not too much to say that nowhere, save in the Revision, has American theological learning reached so high a water mark as in the Standard Bible Dictionary.

If one can afford to buy both of these books he will find it quite worth while and each giving stimulating matter not found in the other. If he must choose one, he will do well to take Jacobus, just as among the larger works one who must choose between Hastings and Cheyne makes no mistake if he takes Hastings. For the average theological scholar, minister or Bible student the five-volume Hastings and the one-volume Jacobus is the most satisfactory equipment.

ERNEST C. RICHARDSON.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG.

An encyclopedia with the history behind it that this has is at a great advantage over similar works without a history: the working and re-working of material, from edition to edition of the Herzog, has resulted in an increasing maturity and perfection within its standards, and a like process may be recognized in the English re-working. There is thus a double perfecting — a ripening into the Herzog-Hauck, which is pretty nearly the climax of modern scholarship in theology, and the growth from the old Schaff-Herzog to the new. The improvement in the latter is even greater than in the former. The old Schaff-Herzog was an excellently conceived and most useful book, but the new bears on almost every page evidence of the advantage which the later work has gained from the experience of Dr. Jackson on the old work and his vast editorial practice in the mean time.

The Herzog type is the select rather than the comprehensive. One does not go to it to look up a topic of which he has never heard before, and the editor has been well advised not to depart too much from the well chastened limited list of topics of the German edition, for, when the well beaten track is left, the field is endless. Even so special an encyclopedia as the Catholic has twice as many topics as this, and the present reviewer's private memoranda contain at least ten times as many topics which might be treated — taking the first one hundred titles A to Adams as test.

But adherence to the Herzog list of topics does not at all mean sticking to the German material. The really surprising thing about this new Schaff-Herzog is the quantity of admirable high class, fresh, new articles not borrowed at all from Herzog. The article on Africa, for example, by Dwight, is a model one, and those on Assyria, Babylonia, Armenia, Annihilationism, some of the articles on denominations and many others, are new and all well up to the standard of the German Herzog.

And the use of the German material is hardly less excellent in its way than the original matter. Often the articles are condensed by the authors themselves, and the extent of this new encyclopedia is sufficient to allow of reasonable treatment, so that the articles, though condensed, give the effect of quintessence rather than mutilation or even abbreviation — it is a very happy quantity indeed that has been hit on for this new work.

THE SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Based on the third edition of the *Realencyklopädie* founded by J. J. Herzog and edited by Dr. Albert Hauck. Samuel Macauley Jackson, D.D., LL.D., editor in chief, Charles C. Colebrook and Geo. W. Gilmore, M.A., associate editors. Complete in 12 volumes, Vols. I and II. \$5.00 vol. Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Testing by the always practical test of one's own accidental needs at the moment: "Ambrosian Chant" proves to be a condensed article by Herold and an almost ideal example of pointed brevity. Again the "Amarna tablets" (Gilmore), and "Agrapha" (Pick) prove to be excellent original articles by American writers, and tend to give an intelligent up-to-date air to the work.

The typography is the same choice, clear style which is used in the Bible Dictionary of the same publishers, almost perfect for its purposes. There is, however, one defect in arrangement which is real though small. The longer articles have the headings *centered* instead of printed from the side line (Abelard) and sometimes even centered as to page (Armenia), thus breaking columns. One is liable to skip articles this way, and hunt back and forth to find.

The bibliographies scattered through the volume, and the general account of religious bibliography at the beginning, are very uncommonly thorough. Every bibliography is by nature vulnerable, but it is rare to find a bibliographical work which is so good a subject for appreciation and so little exposed to carping as this.

The Bible articles are limited to the most important topics, and we may suspect in this some design, since the same publishers are bringing out at the same time a Bible Dictionary, equal in all respects to the best standards of the Herzog. The works are complementary and the user should really have both. The Dictionary of Living Divines, which in the old Schaff-Herzog formed a supplementary volume, is here incorporated, brought up to date and made a peculiarly reliable and useful feature.

It is a matter of congratulation to editor and publisher, and still more to libraries and general users, that the genuine need of a really good encyclopedia for the average user has been met in so adequate a manner, while it is still a matter of regret that the more comprehensive guide to the great mass of religious topics is still lacking and likely to remain lacking. There are, perhaps, few who know and fewer still who care for the topics which are not commonplace, but these few have to work too hard for their knowledge and the world really owes them the aid of a complete encyclopedic guide.

ERNEST C. RICHARDSON.

PATON'S COMMENTARY ON ESTHER.

Professor Paton's book is not only an excellent commentary on Esther, but a model of critical method and presentation. The author has examined and tested carefully and fearlessly; and he has presented his results without *Tendenz* or apology. His well known pedagogical gifts of logical arrangement and clear presentation are everywhere evident; and the ultimate utility of the book is not lost sight of in the mass of exhaustive detail which his tireless industry has led him to collect and adduce.

The problems presented by Esther are not those of critical documentary analysis, but such as demand a knowledge of the versions and of later Jewish literature, and of the possibilities and limitations of literature of this class. To this task Prof. Paton brings an ample special knowledge; and the thoroughness with which the Jewish sources have been reproduced or consulted is gratifying. Of course the question has a more restricted and a larger aspect: (1) The Hebrew text of Esther and the exegesis of the same; (2) The story of Esther in the Bible and in later tradition. As a book with the latter title is promised soon by Prof. Paton, we cannot hold him at present responsible for the completeness of the treatment of this larger subject. He has introduced into the commentary elaborate materials for this task. It is hoped, however, that when he does attempt it, he will take pains to make preliminary studies of the Septuagint text itself. Esther has led a good deal of its checkered career outside the pale of the Hebrew language. Who knows what an examination of the "daughters" of the Septuagint: the Ethiopic, Coptic and Armenian versions especially, might reveal? It is a point not sufficiently emphasized, that a thorough examination of these versions, and a reconstruction of the underlying Greek text, generally easily seen through the transparent medium of these slavishly literal translations, is a necessary task preliminary to the establishment of the Greek text itself. Otherwise the evidence is not all in. The text of Esther is about the worst in the Greek Bible, and a collection of the variants of our printed editions is premature. The painstaking care displayed in the critical apparatus of the commentary deserves, however, unstinted praise, as well as the array of Jewish sources, here for the first time made accessible.

As regards the author's general conclusions: Without advancing any new theory of a startling nature, the position of the

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther, by PROFESSOR LEWIS BAYLES PATON, Ph.D., D.D. The International Critical Commentary, New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1908, pp. xvii, 339. \$2.25.

best modern critical scholarship is maintained. Esther is neither genuine history nor yet an intended allegory. It deserves to be read and accepted at its face value, a task quite beyond us. Its purpose was, "to commend observance of the feast of Purim by an account of the way in which this feast originated." It belongs, as a book, to the late Greek period — first century B. C. The author is a Persian Jew, come to Palestine, who wishes to introduce there the feast of Purim. Not even an historical kernel underlies the story. It belongs to the legendary cycle of Daniel, Tobit, Judith and Third Ezra. The institution has created, or shaped the story. The Babylonian theory of origin is the most reasonable, though the details of identification with the originals are uncertain. The correspondence in names is too complete to be accidental. Mordecai=Márduk, Esther=Ishtar, both Babylonian divinities. Later Jewish tradition connects "Esther" with the Greek Aster, "star."¹ Hadassah=Khadashshatu, "bride," a title applied to goddesses in Babylonia. Haman=Humman, and Vashti=Mashti, both Elamitic deities. Zeresh may be a corruption of Geresh, also Elamitic. The terrific and prolonged struggle of Babylonia with Elam throughout the centuries of her long life, reflected in the Nimrod — or better, Gilgamesh — Epic in which the hero Gilgamesh slays the monster Humbaba, may lie at the base of Esther also. At any rate, the resemblance is striking.

Other matters also point to a mythological origin. The Jewish love for cabbalistic combinations and numerical manipulations, however, leads us to *expect* a schematism of symbolic numbers in such a book as Esther, rather than the contrary; and even if the events had occurred, the writer would have been likely to conform them to a scheme of symbolism. Compare the *third* year of the king's reign; the *one hundred and eighty* days of the first feast; the *seven* days of the second feast; that the king calls for Vashti on the *seventh* day; the *twelve* months of purification; that Esther enters the royal house in the *twelfth* month (acc. to LXX) of the *seventh* year; that the lot is cast until the *twelfth* month; that the scribes are called the first time on the *thirteenth* day; that the massacre was to take place on the *thirteenth* day of the *twelfth* month; that the scribes are called for the second time in the *third* month; that Esther appears before the king on the *third* day; the *seven* chamberlains; the *seven* maidens. Exactly what is back of this is not clear — perhaps these are merely round numbers — but their artificial character is

¹ The Indo-European *aster* itself, may be connected with the name of this ancient divinity. The oldest form is found in S. Arabia: 'Athtar, which however is male. The Tigrê and Bîlîn of Abyssinia use the word 'Astar for "heaven."

apparent, and their grave and pretentious accuracy fails of the intended effect of trustworthiness and historicity.

"There is not one noble character in this book," says Paton (p. 96); but we may add with Nöldeke (in *Encycl. Bib. sub. voc. Esther*) "—except Vashti," for she refused to appear at the king's drunken feast.

That a book of such admitted moral callousness and religious barrenness, so replete with the most repulsive ideas which even Christian satire could attach to Judaism, disapproved of by early Judaism, ignored by Jesus and the New Testament and the Fathers of the early Church, rejected by one branch of the historic Church, a stumbling block and source of irritation and doubt to Luther, the darling of the mediæval synagogue — is still regarded in many quarters as a book from which to teach and preach — gives food for thought.

W. H. WORRELL.

To the general reader Jewish life and history seem to end with the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, or, at least, with the overthrow of Barcochebas in A.D. 135. The after centuries are scarcely thought of, or when they do receive attention, they are pictured as the shadowy survival of pre-Talmudic Judaism. It is with interest, therefore, that we take up a work which is fitted to correct this impression.

Prof. Schechter's *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* deals chiefly with the period of the growth and codification of the Talmud, although frequent reference is made to the great rabbis of the mediæval period. Among the themes which the author treats are, God and the World, God and Israel (including the topic of Election), the Kingdom of God in its Various Aspects, the Law, Sin, and Forgiveness and Reconciliation. His method is as far as possible confined to the presentation of the opinions of the Rabbis on these various themes. Too much stress, Prof. Schechter thinks, has been laid upon matters of legal refinement, too exclusive attention has been drawn to the unapproachable majesty of God, and the merely formal demands of life under the law have been dwelt upon in such a way as to misrepresent the character of Rabbinical religion. "The legalistic element, which might rightly be called the law, represents only one side of the Torah" (p. 117). The conception of *chasiduth* (saintliness) shows that the spontaneity of the spiritual life was not lacking in Rabbinism, and where spontaneity exists there must be a sense for higher things than mere casuistry and pettifogging technique. Much else might be said if space permitted. The chapters on the *Yetzer hara* (evil imagination or propensity) form a very interesting contribution to the anthropology of Judaism. Special interest attaches to the points at issue between Christianity and Judaism. The author believes, and is not afraid to assert, that the destiny of the world lies with Jewish monotheism. While avoiding a tone of con-

troversy, he takes occasion to affirm the Jewish, as against the Christian, views of law, grace, mediation, and justification. On some of these themes we cannot but believe that there is a measure of misapprehension. Surely it was the *ideal* character of law, the *inward* nature of its demands, the infinite requirement of a true obedience, which led the apostle to describe it as the ministry of condemnation. It might be all this, and yet furnish the highest possible stimulus to religious aspiration. So long, indeed, as law is conceived as a realm of religious duty, the performance of its requirements will be as keen a source of gratification as anything else that appeals to the religious sentiment. Should it be recognized, however, not as a sum of particular duties, but as an infinite demand which man, as a sinner, can never meet, it must then be acknowledged that the sinner's hope lies in some action on God's part which is really equivalent to the bestowal of original righteousness. It is much the same with respect to mediation. If it be regarded as a function of the religious relation of man to God, it will necessarily come short of an effective divine-human unity, but if, on the other hand, it is actually the outcome of the gracious relation of God to man, it must then belong to the movement of the life of God himself. Mediation, when measured by the religious aspiration of man, is one thing; mediation as the full expression of the manwardness of God, is quite another. It is not therefore to be wondered at that Prof. Schechter confesses that he does not understand the Epistles of Paul, since the same must be true of anyone, whether he call himself Jew or Christian, who regards the concept religion, or the relation which that conception implies, as perfectly adequate and final. But even when these essential differences are placed in the forefront there can be no doubt that Prof. Schechter has written an exceedingly suggestive and helpful book. It gives insight into the higher characteristics of Rabbinical religion, and it exemplifies the best features of apologetic method. It is a treatise which the appreciative reader will place beside Dr. Mielziner's admirable "Introduction to the Talmud." (Macmillan, pp. xxiv, 384. \$2.25).

W. J. C.

Anselm's Theory of the Atonement is the subject of a very careful study by Professor Foley, of the Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia. It is a critical investigation of the claim that the Reformation dogma is the Catholic doctrine. His conclusion is a negative one; that the Anselmic theory was late in coming into prominence; that it is, indeed, a mere provincialism in Christian theology. Dr. Foley shows a wide acquaintance with the writers on the Atonement from the days of the Apostolic Fathers to the present, and it will be admitted that he makes out a strong case. He believes that the present tendency is, to lay stress on the *fact* that we are reconciled to God through the sacrifice of Christ, with no attempt to define its method or to dogmatize about it. (Longmans xv, 327. \$1.50 net.)

C. M. G.

It is often the case that a class in Sunday-school wishes to know what happened after the New Testament Period. Or an individual, who does not care to read Church History, wishes to follow out the progress of

Christianity. Books suitable for such work have been lacking. The publication of Professor Walker's *Great Men of the Christian Church* will do much to supply this need. Important men in the development of Christianity, from Justin Martyr to Horace Bushnell, are selected. A short account of the life of each one is given, and also his relation to his age. For example, The Times of the Crusades are presented in connection with the life of Godfrey; the struggle between papacy and empire in the Middle Ages, is made clear through the life of Hildebrand. Twenty short biographies are written in Professor Walker's clear, accurate and interesting way. They give a better idea of the development of the Church than some volumes several times as large. (The University of Chicago Press, pp. ix, 378. \$1.50.)

C. M. G.

Paul Sabatier delivered the Jowett Lectures in 1908, and they now appear in a volume entitled *Modernism*. There were three lectures in this course, and from them it is possible to gain an impression of this problem which is at present such an important one in the Roman Catholic Church. The book is passionately, but clearly, written, and arouses sympathy for the pious and scholarly men who still consider themselves members of the Catholic Church, having no sympathy with Protestantism, yet are cut off from Romanism. Sabatier holds that the Modernists are the true Church from which the Romanists have departed. A valuable part of the volume is the appendix, in which the Encyclical on Modernism and other recent deliverances of the Pope, relating to this subject, are given in an English translation. (Scribner, pp. 351. \$1.25.)

C. M. G.

Professor Heron's *Short History of Puritanism* was prepared as a textbook for the Young People's Guild of the Irish Presbyterian Church. It is in every way an admirable production. Clear, concise and accurate, it gives an amount of information about Puritanism, especially the Presbyterian side of the movement, which is not often found in a volume several times the size of this one. (Imported by Scribner's, pp. vi, 236. 50 cts.)

C. M. G.

Mr. John Spargo may be considered the most notable leader of the Socialists in this country. Whether he would be called representative of their views as a whole, might be doubted. An address of his in Cooper Union, two years ago, on *The Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism*, has been reprinted as a book. In it he shows what he considers the religious side of the great movement. He points out that Socialism has many aspects: To the workingman it presents, principally, an economic deliverance; to the thinker, Socialism is the great liberator of the mind from certain intellectual bondage. To the feeling of many others Capitalism brings a religious blight—and Socialism appears as a great vital and vitalizing religious principle. While upholding the other aspects of Socialism, Mr. Spargo is here interested in showing the affinity of Socialism with religion. This he does by pointing to this movement, as something that like religion has been able to embrace all nationalities, colors and creeds within its grasp. He contends that even beyond religion, it has shown a power of appeal, strong enough to over-

come even greater barriers than any one religion, and to unite all in one vast aim, kindling in the hearts of all its adherents one sublime enthusiasm for freedom and brotherhood. Again, no other force than Socialism, like a religious revival, has called forth such faith in humanity and such prospects of universal peace. Again, it has become the spring of an abiding faith and hope to thousands in an age of pessimism and unfaith. He contrasts this with the deadness and fear of the churches untouched by this fire of Socialism. He finds the modern Socialist the true successor to the prophets of old and to Christ himself, in their attacks upon conventionalized religion. He gives Socialism almost the whole credit for the modern philanthropic movement. He uses little perspective in his arraignment of the Church. He meets certain objections to Socialism as tending to absolutely engulf the individual, by showing that Socialism's scheme of equal opportunity is in the interest of the individual. He meets the objection of Socialism's monotony by a picture of the fuller freedom and variety which would come from such emphasized individuality. He meets the supposed antagonism of Socialism to the Family, by denying that the extreme views of some in the past and today, represent the sentiments of Socialists as a whole. The essay breathes a noble conception of the author's faith, removes some evident misunderstandings of extreme positions assigned to them, and forces us to realize the strong elements of faith, of justice and brotherhood in this movement. But it is also arrogant in its exclusive claims, and as unjust in its perspective on many points as the author claims that others are in their attitude toward his party and principles. The essay is one which should be read by ministers, especially as indicating certain elements other than economic in this modern movement. (Huebsch, pp. 94. 50 cts.)

A. R. M.

There are few men so competent to write a book on missions in Turkey as Rev. James L. Barton, D.D. For nearly ten years a missionary in Turkey, and for nearly fifteen years secretary of a Foreign Missionary Board to which has been by common consent entrusted the major part of the missionary work in Turkey, he has had the intimate knowledge of local conditions and racial peculiarities and the wider view which comes from studying local conditions set in a broader horizon and in truer perspective, both of which are to a peculiar degree indispensable if one would familiarize himself with the needs and the results of missionary labor in the Ottoman empire. To this unusual familiarity with his theme, Dr. Barton adds the further qualification of a singularly well-balanced judgment and the statesman's instinct for the relative proportions of things. All of these, together with the possession of an admirably clear literary style, make his book, *Daybreak in Turkey*, one of fascinating interest as well as one containing great masses of information admirably marshaled and truly interpreted. The book contains, to be sure, a history of missions in Turkey, but its unique value lies in the recognition of missions as a factor in the development of the history of a country, and the consequent setting of the missionary activity in its place in the history of the Ottoman empire, and in its relation to past and present social and political conditions. If

one wishes to understand, as who does not, the chain of conditions leading to the recent Turkish revolution, we know of no place where one will be able to secure such a just apprehension of them as from this volume. If one wants to understand the Turkish government and the relation of the Sultan to it, he can turn to this volume for it. If his interests lead him to inquiry respecting the various races and churches to be found in this most composite realm, he will secure information here. If he is perplexed by the difficulty our government has seemed to have in enforcing the rights of Americans to live and work in Turkey, here he will get the cue to it. And so one might go on. It is seldom that a work combines so skillfully the material of an encyclopedia on Turkey with the charm of a narrative as this, and its full index makes the matter available. It is not a volume patched together to supply a demand occasioned by the newly awakened interest in things Turkish, though its closing chapters deal with the Macedonian Question and the Constitutional Government. It was for the most part in type before the revolution, and a considerable part of its material has already been used in courses of lectures in Andover and Chicago Theological Seminaries. Its matter thus has the double advantage of deliberateness of formulation and freshness of interest. (Pilgrim Press, pp. 294. \$1.50.)

A. L. G.

Mind, Religion and Health, by Rev. Robert MacDonald, consists of twelve sermons preached to evening congregations. Four of them are designed to describe the principles and work of the "Emmanuel Movement" in Boston, and eight were given to show how these principles might be employed in daily life. They have been somewhat enlarged in parts for publication and to them have been added certain "Questions and Answers," to the number of nine, which serve instead of notes to further elucidate certain points in the discussion. The book shows wide reading and a clear grasp of what the writer is seeking to portray and is one of the clearest and best balanced presentations of the whole topic we have seen. It is, of course not technical, but is excellent exposition. (Funk and Wagnalls, pp. 368. \$1.30.)

A. L. G.

A Common-Sense View of Mind Cure, by Laura M. Westfall, is an exceedingly clever little book. Its purpose is to supply enough knowledge of the physical structure of the nervous organism, and to illustrate in such obvious ways the interrelations of body and mind, that one will be led to see that it is quite evident that physical results can be produced by mental processes and *vice versa*. There is just enough that is technical on both the physical and psychical side to lead the reader to feel the force of the general line of argument without getting him lost in an unwonted vocabulary. The volume closes with suggestions as to exercises, both physical and mental, which are believed to be of service in at least alleviating some of the most common ailments. Some questions may arise as to the precision of its physiology and metaphysics; but these are not the main points of the book. Its end will be achieved if it makes the reader perceive the naturalness of many things in the various cults of mind cure which are made opaque and mysterious by verbal obfuscations, and at

the same time leads him to set himself seriously to the sort of self-control and discipline of both mind and body by which he can improve both his physical health and his mental soundness. (Funk & Wagnalls. 75 cts.)

A. L. G.

The Cole Lectures of Vanderbilt University for 1908 were delivered by Rev. George Jackson of Toronto and had for their subject *The Fact of Conversion*. Since Starbuck's book on "The Psychology of Religion," there has been on the part of writers of different schools of thought the effort to analyze and interpret the profound central psychological fact which is denominated Conversion. A good deal of confusion often arises from want of discrimination between the analysis of the phenomena of conversion, their classification as purely psychic phenomena, the conditions under which these phenomena may be produced, their value for the upbuilding of character in general, and the validity of their objective reference with respect to the nature of God or the peculiarly Christian view of the world. Mr. Jackson has tried to keep distinct the problems concerned with conversion, and in successive chapters treats The Reality of Conversion as a Fact of Consciousness, The Reality of Conversion as a Fact for Life, Varieties of Conversion, The Rationale of Conversion, the Psychology of Conversion, Present Day Preaching and Conversion. In so doing he has presented what for the minister furnishes on the whole the best general introduction to the subject that we know. It has enough references to literature to start one on wider reading in the various fields suggested and presents conclusions which are in the main sound. And it closes with an earnest appeal to the ministry, in view of the recent studies into the facts of conversion and their religious significance, to recognize their duty and responsibility as those who are set for the stimulation and direction of this mighty fact of the religious consciousness. This is not simply a plea for "revivals"; it is a summons to the ministry to appreciate and live up to the opportunities, privileges and responsibilities of their calling. (Revell, pp. 236. \$1.25.)

A. L. G.

The *Introduction to the Study of Religion*, by Principal Frank Byron Jevons, marks the beginning of a series of volumes which it is hoped will in time supply a library of great value to the cause of missions as well as prove of interest to the student of the Science of Religion and to the general public. This volume contains the first of the "Hartford-Lamson Lectures on the Religions of the World," delivered annually at Hartford Seminary in connection with the course of missionary instruction there provided by a fund established in memory of the late Charles M. Lamson, D.D., pastor of the First Church of Christ in Hartford and also president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The second series in the course was last year delivered by Dr. DeGroot of Leyden and is now in the hands of the publisher.

Mr. Jevons defines religion as "the quest of man for God," and in this introductory course of lectures he discusses the lowest forms of this quest, culminating, however, in a closing lecture showing how that which is being sought for in vague, uncertain and faltering fashion in the lower

forms of the religious life is found in the Christian religion. For the missionary it is peculiarly desirable that he perceive in the lower forms of religion that which is common with the highest form to which he is trying to lead the way. The lectures, after the introductory one, treat respectively of Immortality, Magic, Fetichism, Prayer, Sacrifice, Morality. Each of these is subjected to a critical analysis, its relation to religion as the search after God defined, and suggestions made as to the practical attitude of the missionary to them, and the final lecture is devoted to the place of Christianity in the evolution of religion. In addition to the clarity of the presentation, the charm of the style and the masterful handling of material, perhaps the most noteworthy single feature of the course is the lecturer's development of the position that from the very beginning the nature of religion is social, communal, not merely individual; pointing thus inevitably to its consummation not in the independent relation of a multitude of units to God, but in a divine society—a Kingdom of God. (Macmillan, pp. xxvi, 283. \$1.50.)

A. L. G.

Professor Ramsey, in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, remarks that the religious side of Greek literature calls for a much more serious and systematic treatment than it has ever received. This is precisely what we get in the late Dr. James Adam's Gifford Lectures before the University of Aberdeen, 1904-1906, which were completed for publication only a very short time before the death of their lamented author at the age of forty-seven. The volume has thus a certain monumental character and is fittingly prefaced by a memoir, exquisite in its intimate objectivity, prepared by his wife. In it the story of the Aberdeenshire country lad as he makes his way by persistent industry, brilliancy of scholarship and winsomeness of character to a place of distinction in Cambridge University, is so told as to lead the reader to a singularly vivid appreciation of both the qualities of the man and of his work. The lectures are written in a fascinating and luminous style, showing throughout an unusual combination of breadth of grasp and refinement of minute scholarship. The author divides the *Religious Teachers of Greece* into two classes, the Poets and the Philosophers, and, after an introductory chapter which assigns to poetry and philosophy their places in the development of Greek religious thought, he sketches the development of the great religious ideas from Homer to Sophocles (leaving the discussion of Euripides till after the presentation of the thought of the Sophists), showing the steady trend among the poets to an ennobled conception of God and toward a monotheistic conception of Him. Then, turning to the philosophers, he traces in a similar way the development of thought from Thales to Plato. Dr. Adams possessed to a singular degree the poetic and the philosophic temperament and he was thus peculiarly fitted for the double task he set himself. Whether one is led to the reading of the book by his literary or his philosophic or his religious inclinations, he will find in it that which will gratify and inform him. For the student of Christian theology the chief interest will lie in the way he reveals the approximations of Hebrew and Hellenic thinking, and indicates how in a Christian theologian like Paul we do not find the violent bringing together of fundamentally contrasted ideas, but the normal

synthesis of kindred ideas, each, of course, with its racial coloring. In closing one of his passages where he is comparing Paul with Plato he writes: "I have ventured to quote these parallels from the New Testament, partly because outside the circle of Plato's own writings it is impossible to find language better suited to convey his meaning, and partly also with the subsidiary object of calling attention to the real kinship of thought — illuminating, I think, so far as it goes — between Plato and St. Paul" (p. 360). Such statements tempt one, of course, far afield toward the widely ramifying discussion as to the reciprocal dependence of Hebrew and Greek thinking in the centuries preceding the Christian era, and the relative influence of each in the formulation of historic Christianity. Closing his work with Plato, the author could not, of course, proceed far in this direction. His attitude toward these questions, so far as they are touched, shows an admirable breadth and sanity. It will thus appear that the volume as a whole is one of very unusual interest, value and charm. (Imported by Scribners, pp. lvi, 467. \$4.00.)

A. L. G.

The fact that Rev. J. Stuart Holden has recently come to this country for certain preaching engagements gives interest to a volume of his sermons just published. He is pastor of the Church of St. Paul, Portman Square, London. The sermons published in *Redeeming Vision* are not comparable as "great sermons" with some others which have recently appeared. But few among the greatest are more spiritually suggestive; and few aim so simply and faithfully to interpret the central thought of a verse or passage with little attempt to add more. This volume is a fine illustration of what we may call spiritual exposition: an attempt to unfold the deep, but legitimate, meaning of the text and to give to that meaning a fresh and striking statement of a theme. The volume abounds in unusual illustrations of the fitness of text and theme, and the consequent unity of impression. There is a simple, fresh development, with little formal exegesis or argument or even illustration: but the central thought is grasped with unusual tenacity. (Revell, pp. 214, \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

A booklet by a "veteran pastor," published anonymously, entitled *How to Talk with God*, is a collection of brief prayers, suggested by a particular occasion or following a caption of thought. Two preliminary chapters, "A Personal Explanation" and "How to Talk with God," describe the author's experience and give some directions as to preparation for public prayer. The author dwells upon the importance of preparation for this part of the service of worship. "Sermons I seldom write; prayers I find it necessary to write," he tells us. Sometimes he writes prayers, even if he does not memorize them; sometimes he uses the manuscript in public prayer. The author enumerates seventeen suggestions which should help to enlarge and quicken prayer. The prayers themselves, as published, indicate a wide scope of petitions, some personal and intimate, others of wide range in the outer realms of thought and desire. The language is simple and reverent, without, however, any very marked liturgical value as to rhythm and dignity of phraseology.

The book, as a whole, is helpful and suggestive, especially as indicating the need of more careful preparation for public worship. (S. S. Times Co., pp. 97, 50 cts.)

A. R. M.

The main contention of this book on *Principles of Successful Advertising*, is that the Church should advertise its work more fully. The author, Chas. Stelzle, gives his reasons why; discusses the psychological elements in advertising, its principles and methods. He writes a chapter on "Planning an Advertising Campaign," and gives a great deal of "printing office" information. Here one will find newspaper illustrations, pictures, diagrams, and all the paraphernalia needed. For one who likes this sort of thing, this is the sort of book he will like. (Revell, pp. 172. \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

We have had occasion more than once to review Dr. Matheson's devotional books. This last one, *Messages of Hope*, does not fall below the others, and in many ways is the best one we have read. Coming out of the rich spiritual life of this great man, equally notable in the intellectual world, and famous as a preacher, Dr. Matheson's devotional books would probably be accounted the best of this category; have had a great influence; and will continue to furnish food to the devout life. (Armstrong, pp. 294. \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

Dr. S. D. Gordon has had a wide reading in his earlier books. Three hundred and fifty thousand books of this series have been sold. "Quiet Talks About Jesus," "Quiet Talks on Personal Problems," "Quiet Talks on Power." This last volume is on *Quiet Talks with World Winners*. The component parts of the book are on "World Winning" and "Winning Forces." This is primarily a book designed to stimulate interest in missions, in the most comprehensive sense. But it is less an attempt to make a special plea for this object, than an effort to disclose in a devotional atmosphere that the "Master passion" of the Christian leads inevitably to a loving search for opportunity, emergency and sacrifice to win the world to God. Books of this kind, which might be passed by, in the more formal and scientific presentation of missionary effort, have great power over a larger constituency and deal with the deeper springs of Christian consecration. The sphere of the discussion is in the humbler ranges of every day life and apprehension, and appeals in an intimate, familiar way to the inner emotions. The book is not only stimulating in its presentation of the missionary motive, but it is full of incident and illustration quickening to the personal devotional life. (Armstrong, pp. 280. 75 cts.)

A. R. M.

Professor Hoyt has recently placed us under great obligation for one of the best works on Homiletics which has been written. He now adds to his more technical discussion a book of larger and freer scope in *The Preacher, His Person, Message and Method*. Under the discussion of Personality, he discusses the physical, the intellectual and the spiritual life of the preacher, and adds stimulating and practical chapters on the Enrichment of Personality and The Method of the Spiritual Life. In the

Message he treats of the authority, aim and contents of the Gospel, with a valuable discussion of the social matter for pulpit treatment. The Method deals with evangelistic, expository, doctrinal and ethical preaching, and he adds a chapter on The Ethics of Pulpit Speech. While the main line of thought has to do with preaching, the range of the writer's sympathies is such that he keeps constantly in view the correlate work of the pastorate, a fact which adds a practical and intimate tone to his discussion. His two chapters on the Social Message, and Ethical Preaching combine to give one of the sanest and amplest discussions of this phase of pulpit work. His discussion of the spiritual life impresses one as holding up a high ideal without endorsing some of the extreme Keswick methods. Without a word of controversial disputation about shades of critical and doctrinal attitudes we have seen few essays more helpful along the lines of a Christ-centered message; nor a simpler and yet more compendious presentation of the great truths which demand insistence, after granting all liberty to personal predilection. His chapter on Expository Preaching is one of the best. The quotations from the current literature of preaching are abundant: too frequent, in our judgment, making an undue proportion in the material, detracting somewhat from the original force of the author's own thoughts, which need little confirmation. The book in its scope most nearly resembles Cuthbert Hall's Carew Lectures here; and in its high quality of presentation, deserves a place alongside the Yale Lectures on Preaching. (Macmillan, pp. 380. \$1.50.)

A. R. M.

Lord Avebury is better known as Sir John Lubbock. He is a man of ripe years, who has played a conspicuous part in many fields of modern life. In early life he was a banker, he has represented the University of London in Parliament, he has been widely influential in political counsels. He has been eminent in the learned world and a writer on scientific subjects, botany, zoölogy, anthropology. The title page of his book (rather grotesquely) enumerates 60 or more degrees and titles conferred by the scholarly world. This background of varied service and wide ranging experience, adds significance to this particular volume at this particular time. It discloses the wide field of induction he has in mind, and the intense activities and varied services, out of which, by experience, he can write of *Peace and Happiness*. The book is notable for its great optimism; for the discussion of the rich resources for joy, pleasure, and enthusiasm and content such a man may have in a busy life. It is a work of great tonic value for the time. It shows how rich a man may be in mind, and how young in spirit, who enters the great worlds of the mind and heart to find peace and refreshment. The range of learning in this book is great; the resourcefulness of quotation, and the many sided appreciation of all phases of life, learning, literature, science and religion—all conspire to make this book a thesaurus of inspiration and uplift, coming not only from religion but from the mental vocations of life. The book is full of sincerity, and we feel the simplicity a man may retain in thought and style while yet immersed in the literary and scientific world. The book is as full of

citations as Montaigne, but used with more order, and in an utterly different spirit from the Frenchman. He has no specific recipe for Peace and Happiness. There is not much originality in his old rubrics of sound morals, good health, love of nature, the Christian spirit; but it is the enthusiasm and optimism which are notable throughout, and which give significance to his testimony. (Macmillan, pp. 386. \$1.50 net.)

A. R. M.

We do not know how many hidden poets there are in our Hartford circle, though we catch occasional gleams of verse from one and another of the brotherhood. But the publication of a whole volume of poems by a Hartford man, is a rare event. Hence it is a real pleasure to welcome the *Voices of Faith and Love*, that Dr. Stephen G. Barnes has lately put forth in modest but tasteful guise for the delight and cheer, not only of his many personal friends, but of those who do not know him. These poems, as the preface tells us, have been written and most of them printed at intervals, often drawn forth by some special circumstance or event. They clearly represent something of the writer's inner life as it moved from one experience or range of thought to another. They have the precious value of genuine self-revelation—attempted not for self-display or even so much for the relief of self-expression, but that what has been spiritually helpful to the author may be shared with others. The themes are all religious in some way and often explicitly devotional; and the treatment is sincere, warm and sensitive, always expressive of a profound and winning spirituality. We are conscious that the book comes from a preacher's hand, but its tone is not so much didactic as companionable and confidential.

On the technical side, the book attracts by its variety of measure, diction and style. Some pieces are in blank verse, some are sonnets, some songs of greater or less degree, and some true hymns. Dr. Barnes' extensive literary experience shows in his desire to try many forms, and in his dexterity in handling them. On the whole, perhaps the sonnets are the most successful in technique, for sometimes in the more lightly lyrical verses, there is not quite the pure musicalness of diction and movement that one might crave. But there is no carelessness or harshness. And everywhere the energy and weight of the thought shines through the outward style. (Caledonian Co., St. Johnsbury, Vt., pp. 103. \$1.00.)

W. S. P.

Boy's Eye Views of the Sunday School, by "Pucker," tells of Sunday School methods and experiences from the standpoint of the pupil. "Pucker" is, of course, the nickname of the small boy through whose eyes we are invited to see what the Sunday School is really like. We catch glimpses, too, of the tireless effort of the wide-awake worker, whether teacher or superintendent, to make his school what it ought to be. Such topics as vacation, the home department, cradle-roll, and decision day, receive due attention. "Pucker" tells how the interest of the small boys was enlisted in getting up a "Bible-Christmas," the celebration of which consisted in giving rather than in receiving, and how the "home department messengers" enjoyed a week's camping out

with "Brother Parker," and, finally, for this is the climax of the book, of his own personal experience of faith in Christ and what decision day has meant for him. The author, Rev. W. O. Rogers, is a leading Sunday School worker in Oklahoma, with five or six years' experience as field secretary of the State Organization. Out of the abundance of his labors he certainly has a message for those who are engaged in this same line of Christian service. (Sunday School Times Pub. Co., Phila., pp. 110. 60 cents.)

W. J. C.

Among the Alumni

EASTERN NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the Eastern New England Association was held on March 1st at the Commonwealth Hotel, Boston. The meeting was called to order by the president, William W. Sleeper, '85, and there were about seventy alumni and friends present. Brief addresses were made by President S. B. Capen of the American Board, Secretary J. L. Barton, '85, President M. J. Fenenga of Northland College, Wisconsin, Lyndon S. Crawford, '79, of Trebizond, Turkey, and Lorin S. Gates of Sholapur, India; and several songs were sung by Mrs. May Sleeper Ruggles, accompanied by Professor H. Dike Sleeper, '91. The principal address was by President Mackenzie upon "Scientific Method and the Person of Christ," which was listened to with so much interest that at its close he was asked to have it published for wider circulation. The meeting was felt to be one of the best that the Association has held. The president for the coming year is William E. Strong, '85.

The news has only recently been received that ISRAEL NEWTON TERRY, of the class of 1875, died on July 16, 1908, at Utica, N. Y., where he was pastor of the Westminster (Presbyterian) Church. Mr. Terry, although long a sufferer from Bright's disease, had continued active till within a week of his death. He was the third of the name to pass through the Seminary, his father having graduated in 1838, and his uncle in 1843. He himself was born at South Weymouth, Mass., in 1851; took his college course at Amherst, and had also a supplementary seminary year at Union Seminary. He was ordained in the Presbyterian Church in 1876, and held a succession of pastorates in Central New York, first at New Hartford and finally at Utica. He is survived by his wife, to whom he was married in 1880.

The most striking happening in the alumni circle during recent weeks, is the election of OZORA S. DAVIS, '94, of New Britain, Conn., to the presidency of Chicago Seminary, and his acceptance, after friends of the seminary had taken steps to relieve it from certain embarrassments under which it has lately been laboring. The regret over Dr. Davis' leaving his field of work in New Britain, where he has been pastor in the

South Church for five years, has found expression in numerous ways, both official and personal, and he carries with him to his new responsibilities, a large amount of warm good wishes.

Among other changes of ministerial relation we note that ROBERT J. BARTON, '87, recently of Cambridge, Vt., is called to the church in Colchester, in the same state; that CHARLES F. WEEDEN, '87, pastor of the Central Church in Lynn, Mass., since 1901, has resigned his charge; that CARLETON HAZEN, '91, has gone from the church in Portland, Conn., to that in Kensington; that FREDERIC M. HOLLISTER, of the same class, is on the point of removing from the church at Cromwell, Conn., to that at North Stonington; that EDWARD A. LATHROP, '95, who has been preaching at Tryon, N. C., is called to the Union Church in connection with Piedmont College at Demorest, Ga.; that JESSE BUSWELL, '98, has resigned from the church at Mantorville, Minn.; that JOHN A. HAWLEY, '98, has declined a call to remove from Shelburne Falls, Mass., to Mansfield; that TELESOPHORE TAISNE, '02, after six years with the Sixth Street Church in Auburn, Me., has accepted a call to Durham, N. H.; that HERBERT L. MILLS, '03, of the Hillside Church in Omaha, Neb., is about to go to the church in Trenton, in the same state; that LUTHER M. STRAYER, '03, recently of Glastonbury, Conn., now becomes pastor of the church at Old Saybrook; that WILLIAM M. PROCTOR, '04, who has been in service at Ritzville, Wash., has accepted the post of superintendent to the Church Extension Society of Spokane; and that CLARENCE A. LINCOLN, '05, who has been assistant pastor in St. Louis, has accepted a call to the pastorate of the First Church, in Moline, Ill.

Happenings in the Seminary

On January 27th, Prof. Carl Clem of the University of Bonn visited the Seminary as a special lecturer. He spoke upon the Dependence of Christianity upon Non-Jewish Religions. He canvassed the views of many modern European scholars, excluded any appreciable influence of Buddhism or Mithraism, recognized traces of Assyrian, Babylonian and Greek elements and reached the conservative conclusion that the central ideas of Christianity are its own.

The Carew lectures for the current year were given in January by Professor C. S. Nash of Pacific Theological Seminary, on the live theme of the Congregational Polity today. He discussed in six lectures, Essential Congregationalism, Ministerial Leadership, Forms of Local Fellowship, State Unification and Superintendence, National Unity and Congregationalism, and Church Union. The vigor and sanity of his views fully justified and accounted for his growing influence in matters of polity among Congregationalists. It will be further strengthened by the circulation of these lectures in book form. Professor Nash's introductory allusions to his own student days in Hartford Seminary were gratifying to many of his hearers.

Professor Macdonald, as Hartford-Lamson lecturer for this year, is in the midst of his course of eight lectures on Some Aspects of Islam Suggestive to the Missionary. He is speaking in particular of the Muslim East as it presents itself, the Person and Life of Mohammed, the Koran, Muslim Theology and Metaphysics, the Mystical Life and the Dervish Fraternity, the Muslim Attitude to the Scriptures and to the Person of Christ, the Missionary Activity of Muslims, Muslim Ideas of Education, the Inner Side of Muslim Life, Popular Literature and a Missionary's Reading. During Professor Macdonald's recent sojourn of a year in Cairo and the Eastern Mediterranean region, he gathered much fresh material for these lectures, and their vivid color and free movement is due largely to his contacts with and conversations with representative religious Moslems. This course will form the third volume in the Hartford-Lamson series, published by the Macmillan Co., the first, by Principal Jevons, an Introduction to Comparative Religion, having already appeared, and the second, by Professor De Groot, on the Religions of the Chinese, being in press.

The Day of Prayer for colleges was observed in much the usual way. The families of the faculty, students and members of the School of Religious Pedagogy united in an impressive Communion Service in the morning. Following this the students and the faculty held meetings for prayer and conference. In the afternoon a general Seminary meeting

was addressed by Rev. Ozora S. Davis, D.D., on Spirituality Today, and reports were brought from the colleges. E. R. Allen spoke for the institutions of the Pacific Coast, C. J. Greene for Princeton, W. F. Rowlands of student interests in Wales, M. C. Tunison for Michigan University, W. F. English, Jr., for Dartmouth, D. A. Dikijian for the students of Armenia, and A. Akana for the young men of the Hawaiian Islands.

Among addresses by speakers from outside the Seminary may be mentioned those of Rev. Dana W. Bartlett, head of the Bethlehem Institutions, Los Angeles, Cal., on the Better City; Dr. Thomas N. Hepburn, Hartford, on the Morals of Sex; Rev. E. P. Parker, D.D., on the Decalogue; Rev. Marion L. Burton, Brooklyn, on the Overcoming Church; Secretary Guild on the Work of the Congregational Church Building Society; and Frank A. Arnold, Probation Officer of the Hartford Police Court.

The shining social event of the winter for the Seminary family was the Washington's Birthday entertainment and reception. Faculty, students and best friends formed the favored audience at the Graduation Exercises of So Punk College. All the stored up wit of the year was discharged in one flash, two hours long. There were brilliant moments and some just lurid, and all of them warm with amicable intent. There was fun enough to go round and work again next day.

Toward the end of March, the Seniors spent three days with Professor Merriam in seeing typical agencies of religion and philanthropy in New York. The party was received for free interviews by Rev. Dr. Laidlaw, President of the Federation of Churches, Rev. Dr. Hillis, and Hon. Frank Moss, President of the Society for the Prevention of Crime. Ellis Island was visited, the Municipal Lodging House on the East Side, and various Missions in that region. Studies in organization were made at the Salvation Army Headquarters, the United Charities Building and St. Bartholomew's Parish House. Church services were attended at will and visits made to such great Sunday Schools as those of the Paulist Fathers, St. George's, Temple Emmanuel, Bushwick Ave., Methodist Episcopal and Christ Memorial, Presbyterian.

The Sixth Conference of Collegemen on the Ministry, held at Hosmer Hall, April 2-4, ranks among the best of the series, in attendance and interest. Eighty-three men registered, thirty being theological students from Union, Yale and Berkeley, and fifty-three representing fifteen eastern colleges. The Bowdoin and Lafayette men came the farthest. Williams and Wesleyan sent the largest delegations. The visitors were hospitably entertained by Hartford families, but came to the Seminary dining room for some of their meals and so got a glimpse of the daily life here, and some idea of the spirit of the place. There were numerous evidences of enjoyment and serious impression as the Conference went on. It could hardly be otherwise where so thoughtful a company of young men were hearing a set of addresses of such variety and power.

Bishop Brewster was felicitous in his words of welcome, and for the five sessions of the Conference the themes and speakers were as follows:

"The College Student and the Ministry," Rev. J. W. Cochrane,

Secretary Presbyterian Board of Education; "The Public Influence of the Ministry," Rev. Harry E. Fosdick, Pastor First Baptist Church, Montclair, N. J.; "The Call to the Ministry," Mr. Robert E. Speer, Secretary Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions; "The Temptations of the Ministry," Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D., Pastor Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; "The Church as the Corporation of Christ," Rev. Rockwell H. Potter, D.D., Pastor First Church of Christ, Hartford; "Intellectual Preparation for the Ministry," President Mackenzie; "The Ministry and Evangelism," Rev. Francis T. Browne, Ph.D., Pastor First Methodist Episcopal Church, New Haven; "Spiritual Preparation for the Ministry," Professor P. M. Rhinelander, Cambridge Theological School; "A Layman's View of the Ministry," Hon. Edward M. Shepard, LL.D., New York; "The Inspirations of the Pastorate," Professor B. W. Bacon, Yale Divinity School; "The Preacher and Present Day Problems," Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., LL.D., Pastor Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York.

Preparations for the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Seminary are well advanced. All signs point to a notable commemoration. On Sunday, May 23d, in some thirty pulpits of Hartford and the vicinity, simultaneous sermons on the Ministry will be preached by men in some way connected with Hartford Seminary. A similar service can be rendered by the Alumni generally, if they will act upon the suggestion of a leading young Alumnus, and preach on the same subject in their own pulpits, the Sunday before or after the Anniversary. Since the announcement of the program in the January *Record*, President Faunce of Brown University, has been secured as a speaker in the Conference on Religious Education; President Davis of Chicago Seminary, has been transferred to Wednesday's Conference on Theological Education and the Life of the Church, and Professors Kilpatrick of Toronto, and Shailer Mathews of Chicago University, have accepted invitations to speak at the same session.

Facilities for social reunions of classes will be provided, and entertainment offered. A large attendance of Alumni is hoped for.

Much interest is already taken in the Anniversary volume, entitled "Recent Christian Progress—A Survey of the Last Seventy-five Years," to judge from the advance subscriptions which have come in. The book will be published by the Macmillan Company, and is now in process of printing.

A Ministerial Retreat will be held at the Seminary for two days, beginning Monday P. M., May 31st. A committee of Hartford clergymen, of several denominations, is coöperating with the Seminary in this effort; and all ministers within reach will be welcome. Invitations have been sent out widely through southern New England. Rev. R. F. Horton, of London, will speak several times and will be assisted by Professor Nash of the Cambridge Divinity School; Professor Woelfkin of Rochester Theological Seminary, and Rev. J. Adam, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of East Orange, N. J.

One can hardly wish for better results in fellowship and impulse than were realized through the similar Retreat four years ago

FOREIGN-BORN --- --- AMERICANS

Describing the work now
done by Congregationalists
in the education of Christian
leaders for our non-English
speaking population. . . .

18 PAGES.

Price 10 cents. Post Paid.

HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS,

HARTFORD, CONN.

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

VOL. XIX, NO. 3—JULY, 1909.

[Entered at the Hartford Post Office as Second Class Matter.]

Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 30 cents. Remit to Order of HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS, Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Conn.

EDITORIAL BOARD :—Professor Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor Waldo Selden Pratt, Professor Austin Bradley Bassett. *Business Manager* :—Eugene Barnard Smith.

In this number of the RECORD we omit the usual departments and devote our whole space to the Exercises in connection with the celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Hartford Seminary, and greatly increase our pages in order to include them all. In the next issue the space will be devoted almost entirely to the other departments of the magazine. We are confident that our readers will prefer this rather than to have the unity of the impression of the various addresses marred by separating them between two numbers of the magazine. While it has proved impracticable to present the addresses, with the exception of the Historical Address, in full as delivered, the abridgements have been so slight that these reports present not only the substance, but also the spirit of the spoken word. It is seldom that such an occasion affords a greater variety of interesting speakers and topics. The large body of enthusiastic alumni who returned, and the full attendance on all the exercises made the occasion one of the greatest interest and significance.

The Program of exercises as it occurred is placed before the addresses. But the material has been arranged somewhat differently, divided into three parts, the first presenting the past of the Seminary and including various matters of history; the second exhibiting the present, in the Graduating Exercises of the Seminary and of the School of Religious Pedagogy; the third

touching the future, and presenting the onlook with respect to the future of theological education, and of religious education in general, as it appeared at the two Conferences and in the wide outlook of the Public Celebration.

There are few men in public life today who so frequently as President Eliot of Harvard University have chosen to assume the rôle of *enfant terrible*. Again and again has his penchant for the part appeared in connection with the affairs of university administration, in both its intellectual and its physical relations. The two words "electives" and "football" will be sufficient to call up instances to the reminiscent mind. In common life it is the *enfant terrible* who calls the attention of the assembled guests to the fact that the soup is briny, or that an unexpected increment to the number at table has sadly reduced the size of the portions of ice cream. His function is to bring into the open facts or conditions that, from timidity, prudence or ignorance, those present have refrained from giving expression to. In Dr. Eliot's speech at the Harvard Summer School of Theology this eminent occupant of a seat at the table of public opinion again appears in this familiar and favorite impersonation and, as usually happens in such circumstances, people forget their "manners" and begin to say what they really think. This is not the place to discuss the historical or speculative grounds on which the germinal existence of a "new religion" is based. It is worth while, however, to have a man of wide acquisition, unquestionable honesty, and profound earnestness, even though no theological specialist, express his opinion of the inevitable outcome of certain historical views as to the facts of the life of Jesus, when combined with certain current speculative interpretations of the nature of God and of the universe of matter and mind. He is quite correct in saying that the outcome will be something other than Christianity, *if* his conception of Christ, and his conception of God and His relation to man and the world in which man lives, is correct. It will be something other than Christianity, not simply as formulated in the Reformation and ecumenical creeds, not simply as expressed in every book of the New Testament,

except in the hypothetically imagined sources of the Gospels; but it will be something different from the Christian religion as it has entered into and molded the life of any individual we know in the history of vital Christian faith from the time of the contemporaries of Jesus to the present. President Eliot is quite right in characterizing the religion which he describes, not as Christianity, but as a "new religion." For his frankness and his precision we would thank him. The real question is yet to be put. Is this religion not only "new," but is it true; true to rational thinking, true to historic fact, and, chief of all, true to the deepest needs and profoundest realities of human nature?

The many celebrations of Calvin's birth have left nothing more plain than that Calvinism does not fit modern requirements in the way of a theology or a principle of life. There are plenty of reasons for it, of course, but a remark recently made by a very intelligent layman in respect to an altogether different matter throws on it a glimmering sidelight. The remark was this, "What we want is not bare justice, but we want the fair thing." In an age of aristocracy and despotism, when an oppressed people looked in vain for an even balancing of the scales by civil rulers or ecclesiastics, when "favor" was the path to success, when *noblesse oblige* was a concession not an equity, it was natural that the conception of even-handed justice on the part of a sovereign God should be a most alluring, winsome, and adorable quality. Justice was of itself a gracious bestowal. The modern man, on the other hand, doesn't care for justice. He takes it for granted that he can get this; what he wants is something better, something "fair," something that shall have in it the quality of love. His neighbor, and his God, ought to love him and give him the best, no matter whether or not he loves either God or man. He comes galloping home and says, "never mind the past, where is the calf?" A just ephah and a just hin have no particular attractions for him; he wants his measure pressed down and running over. Moreover he wants it of right, not of grace. The question is not whether his character justly entitles him to it, the notion that he should receive it, if he

receive it at all, by favor, does not occur to him. Is not God loving, should not other men love him? This is a law of divine and human nature. Such being the case, the best and the most is his right. He wants what is "fair"; he doesn't care for what is just simply just. Now, of course, there is something of parody in such an extreme statement. Yet it reproduces a prevalent thought of the time — the demand for love, even sacrificial love, as a *right*. It is not strange that society in such a frame of mind has no use for Calvinism. No system of thought, theological or any other, emanating from the middle of the sixteenth century can fit men in the beginning of the twentieth. But there are two great words that come out of that period which our own would do well to reincorporate into the vocabulary of human living — Justice *and* Grace.

Exercises in Celebration

of the

Seventy-Fifth Anniversary

of

Hartford Theological Seminary

May Twenty-third to Twenty-sixth

Nineteen Hundred and Nine

SUNDAY, May 23

Sermons on the Christian Ministry

In numerous Churches of Hartford and vicinity; and by many Alumni in
their distant Pulpits

MONDAY, May 24, at 2.30 o'clock

Conference on Religious Education

The Field of Religious Education

Rev. Henry F. Cope

Secretary of the Religious Education As-
sociation

The Church and Religious Education

President W. H. P. Faunce, D. D., LL. D.

Brown University

The Training of the Teacher

Rev. Franklin McElfresh

Superintendent of the Teacher Training
Department of the International Sun-
day School Association

8.00 o'clock

**Graduation Exercises of the Hartford School
of Religious Pedagogy**

Address — The Challenge of Our Time

President Henry C. King, D. D., LL. D.

Oberlin College

TUESDAY, May 25, at 10.00 o'clock

Exercises of Alumni Day

Business of the Annual Meeting of the Alumni Association

Hartford Alumni in Foreign Missions

Rev. James L. Barton, D. D., '85

Foreign Secretary of the American Board
of Commissioners for Foreign Missions

Hartford Alumni in Home Missions

Rev. Henry H. Kelsey, '79

Minister of the Fourth Congregational
Church, Hartford

12.00 o'clock

Alumni Prayer Meeting

Followed by informal luncheon and Class Reunions

2.30 o'clock

Historical Address

Professor Waldo S. Pratt, Mus. D.

Hartford Alumni in Education

Professor Williston Walker, D. D., '86

Yale Divinity School

Hartford Alumni in Literature

Ernest C. Richardson, Ph. D., '83

Librarian of Princeton University

Hartford Alumni in the Pulpit

Rev. Nicholas Van de Pyl, '89

Minister of the Center Congregational
Church, Haverhill, Massachusetts

6.30 o'clock

Anniversary Dinner

Address by the Dean

Professor M. W. Jacobus, D. D.

Addresses of Congratulation

WEDNESDAY, May 26, at 9.00 o'clock

Annual Meetings of the Trustees and Pastoral Union

10.30 o'clock

Graduation Exercises

Address — The Present Task of the Ministry
President Woodrow Wilson, LL. D.
Princeton University

Charge to the Graduating Class
President W. Douglas Mackenzie, D. D., LL. D.

Announcement of Prizes, Conferring of Degrees and Diplomas

2.30 o'clock

**Conference on Theological Education and the
Life of the Church**

The Bible
Professor T. B. Kilpatrick, D. D.
Knox College, Toronto

The Essential Message
President Ozora S. Davis, D. D., '94
Chicago Theological Seminary

The Social Task
Professor Shailer Matthews, D. D.
Dean of the Divinity School, University of
Chicago

The Spiritual Life
Rev. John P. Jones, D. D.
Pasumalai, India

8.00 o'clock

Public Celebration in the Center Church

Address
Rev. R. F. Horton, D. D.
Minister of the Lyndhurst Road Congrega-
tional Church, Hampstead, London

The Seminary and the City
Rev. Rockwell Harmon Potter, D. D.
Minister of the First Church of Christ,
Hartford

The Seminary and the Nation
Rev. Hubert C. Herring, D. D.
Secretary of the Congregational Home Mis-
sionary Society

The Seminary and the World
Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL. D.
President of the American Board of Com-
missioners for Foreign Missions

HISTORICAL REVIEW

HISTORICAL ADDRESS

BY PROFESSOR WALDO SELDEN PRATT, MUS.D.

An anniversary like the one which we are today celebrating has many uses, among them none more important than this — to remind us that every institution, as it persists through the years, acquires the qualities of a living organism. We speak of its birth, its youth and its maturity, of its development and discipline, of its traits and temper, and even of its life, as of an individual. These are not mere metaphors. No sooner do men organize for the orderly, continuous pursuit of a common end, than they set up a corporate personality, which is more than a rhetorical or legal fiction; for presently this personality asserts its own character and momentum, paradoxically exceeding the sum of the several agencies that seem to constitute or administer it. This is clearly true of such compact corporations as undertake definite tasks in education. Most of all is it true of an institution like this Seminary. Seventy-five years ago it was born, the child of deep convictions and earnest faith. Tended through its youth by various guardians and guides, it attained ere long a vitality that even serious difficulties could not suppress, and an impetus onward that even its most sanguine friends could not measure. It has undergone great transformations, so that what it now is seems strangely diverse from what it was even fifty years ago. Yet today, as our retrospect ranges backward over the decades, we can see clearly that its personal identity has been preserved intact, so that the Hartford Seminary of 1909 is as vitally linked with the Institute of Connecticut of 1834 as is any mature manhood with its own childhood. Surely, as we contemplate this extended institutional life, we cannot escape a peculiar thrill within our souls, both of wonder and of worship, for, as we look, we find ourselves standing in the very presence

of that gracious and mighty Providence which takes what men's feeble fingers fashion and then proceeds to mold it for purposes and to project it along paths that reach far beyond all their shrewdest wisdom or their most daring imagination.

The duty laid upon me on this august occasion is no easy duty. That it falls to me arises from the accident that I am the only remaining relic in the faculty of a régime that is now almost a piece of antiquity. Yet, in the economy of society, as in that of geology, even fossils have their use. At first sight, perhaps, one who has been connected with this Seminary for more than a quarter-century might be expected to speak with assurance of its history. But, on the other hand, it is clear that I have stood too close to its heart to behold it with the objective and dispassionate eye of a critical historian. So, by your leave, I shall today speak simply as a humble annalist of but selected topics, remarking upon them only from certain points of personal observation.

My task is indefinitely lightened by the fact that in 1884, at our Fiftieth Anniversary, we were privileged to hear a monumental Historical Address from our beloved Dr. William Thompson, who was qualified to speak as no one else could — or ever can — about the half-century then past, since he had been in service for the whole of that long period. With the vivid memory, not only of what Dr. Thompson said on that occasion, but of all he was and all he stood for, I shall not seek to imitate or duplicate his line of thought. It would be most unbecoming for me to traverse again that entire early history into which he entered with such delicate sympathy and luminous insight. You will naturally look to me, I take it, first, for a compact survey of the several principal stages through which the Seminary has passed, and second, for some fuller reference to the period, just preceding that in which we now are, with which I have been personally familiar. Not to detain you too long, I must limit myself to events prior to the coming of President Mackenzie in 1903, for the story of his fruitful and inspiring administration properly belongs to him who shall be the historian at our Centennial Celebration in 1934.

It is convenient and historically correct to distinguish three major periods in the life of the Seminary hitherto. The first of these is the longest—about thirty years—extending from the founding in 1834 to the removal to Hartford in 1865. The second includes not only the fifteen years in temporary quarters in Prospect Street, but the first years here on Broad Street, that is, from 1865 to somewhat after 1880, its conclusion being slightly vague, depending on when it is assumed that the pedagogical revolution under Dr. Hartranft began. The third set in at that point, whenever it was, and reaches to the opening of Dr. Mackenzie's administration in 1903, into which it merged without noticeable change. The first and second belong together, while the third stands in strong contrast as regards many features. Of the first two I shall speak only in a general way.

Everyone knows that the East Windsor Seminary arose in the midst of controversy. Reference to this fact need carry no contemptuous implication as to either party in that historic debate or as to the resulting institution. We are not called to traverse the field of dispute afresh or to take sides in the battle once fought upon it. Our New England theological atmosphere has always been somewhat highly charged with electricity, its currents to and fro frequently producing controversial phenomena in which sound, light and heat are mingled in varying proportions. At certain junctures the outward displays have been spectacular, commanding general public attention—with the unhappy result that too many observers are more concerned whether they themselves are positive or negative in the particular discharge than as to the nature and quality of the fundamental forces in play. To pursue the figure a step further—the mere pyrotechnics of crossed or grounded wires have often proved more fascinating than sober scrutiny of the trunk-lines and dynamos that lie in the background.

Three-quarters of a century ago theological scholarship was still governed by some postulates that now seem not fully warranted, and was still chiefly pursued with the implements of logic and metaphysics, unhelped by those of natural or historical science. Mere definitions of terms or summaries of dogmatic views were often made the critical, if not the only, factors in

reasoning as rigid as that of geometry. On every hand the authority of the Scriptures was invoked under a narrow and dogmatic theory of exegesis. It was inevitable, amid such conditions of thought, that sharp controversies should arise, and that earnest men should array themselves in opposition, all under what they felt to be unquestionable banners of truth. These conditions have not by any means passed away. They can never wholly disappear, since language and literature are essential instruments in forming and expressing thought. But, as compared with the present, it cannot be doubted that these conditions seventy-five years ago were far less conducive to breadth, depth and fruitfulness of discussion than now.

From this it follows that for most of us the attempt to reconstruct in full the dialectical problems of the fathers is both difficult and needless. Much more needless is it to try to decide which party in a given case had the best of it. We should run the risk of becoming involved in just that intellectual tangle of terms, dissociated from historical facts and eternal realities, which we now seek to avoid. It is much more fruitful and inspiring to seek to realize what were the motives and sentiments that gave vitality and dignity to these battles of the schools. Here we may often discover that we are in fraternal accord with saints of old whose precise contentions are obsolete and whose polemics seem inconclusive. In some cases this accord may appear to embrace both sides of a given dispute, for both may have been actuated by substantially similar impulses and aspirations.

So we may turn wholly away from the details of the debates amid which this Seminary came into being. The questions ostensibly at issue are no longer in the arena of urgency. Certain forms of statement and of argument then prominent are no longer used. In view of this contrast, someone may hastily challenge our initial assertion about the manifest continuity and identity in the life of this institution. Yet it is true, and true in a much more vital sense than if we were today repeating with mechanical iteration the idioms and formulæ of two or three generations ago. Continuity of life consists not in identities of feature, dress or language, but in the unity of soul and spirit.

The founders of this Seminary were men who believed with all their hearts in the basal principles of Christianity as a system of faith and conduct, in the divine commission of the Church to conserve and propagate these principles, in the supreme dignity of the ministry as the appointed agency of leadership in the Church; who revered the Scriptures as recording and expounding the substance of God's self-revealing purpose and plan in history; who passionately adored the Saviour as Master, Redeemer and King; who were willing to sacrifice themselves and all that they had for the extension of His kingdom and His redemptive power throughout the world; and who acknowledged the perpetual ministry of the Spirit in their hearts and wills. We may thank God that in every decade since their day this Seminary has been governed and served by those who are vitally at one with them in these high devotions and these eager consecrations. Year unto year has handed along this precious and majestic heritage, into which we of today have entered, and none of us can imagine that the heritage will ever be diminished or set aside. In every deepest concern, therefore, there has never been but one animating principle of life in this institution.

The faith of the founders had every element that makes faith confident and prevailing. It was a whole-hearted trust in a personal Lord and Master whom they knew and loved. It was a reverent acceptance of all the truth of God that they were able to discern through any medium of revelation or inquiry. It was a sure conviction that whatever conforms to His thought and purpose rests upon abiding foundations. They were led to feel that fidelity to this truth of God, especially as regards the furnishing of the Gospel ministry, and as regards the conversion and salvation of men through the ministry, demanded the setting up of a separate institution upon a basis differing in some respects from any in existence. Believing this, it was inevitable that they should act. It proved that with them stood a sufficient number to form a unique association, originally composed only of active ministers, called the Pastoral Union, and that under its official care the new Seminary could be started with the most necessary means for its work. It also proved from year to year that there were students who desired to avail themselves of the opportunities

offered. And, as the central factor in the whole, it proved that devoted instructors could be found to administer the curriculum.

It is certainly true that during this whole first period the Seminary did not enjoy any large degree of outward prosperity. Its largest material asset was the property at East Windsor Hill—a site with many real advantages in itself, though, as it proved, inconveniently isolated. Its endowment was never adequate, though it was gradually increased, and its annual support had to be secured largely by subscription—this fact, by the way, implying that behind it lay some measure of popular approval. But its finest asset was personal—the character, mind and devotion of its faculty and immediate guardians. These men continued to feel, though at many times assailed by a somewhat fierce tempest of invective, that there were deep reasons for the Seminary's existence, that they had a witness within that they were working in harmony with divine purposes, and that their work, wrought under God, was being approved by Him. It probably has not been the privilege of many of us here today to know more than one or two of the fathers of the Seminary, but no one who has had that privilege can doubt for a moment that their conviction and faith about it were something more than an oddity of opinion or a perversity of judgment. We are not called today to think all their thoughts after them, but we are called to emulate the depth and persistence of their courage and zeal. We may not penetrate the mystery of their inner communion with God, but of the fact of that communion we may be absolutely sure. And something of the secret of their godliness they succeeded in building into the bone and sinew of this Seminary. The Spirit of God has been regnant in this circle always, and the tokens of His presence have been unmistakable. No one can safely cavil at what He has sanctified and blessed.

Saying this, you will observe, is far enough from saying that it makes no difference about the substance of the fathers' contention if only they were sincere and if they were good men. I simply wish to insist that historic justice necessitates our holding that in their contention there must have been principles of feeling and decision that were sound and right, since,

as the years passed, these principles evinced the quality of continuance that they did, and have brought forth, by a natural process of evolution, the quality of fruitage that we see all about us today. Here is the true bequest of the generations to us, one of which we may well be humbly proud and instinctively sure. No matter how the phrasing of opinions may change, or the accents of teaching, or the machinery of social relation, we find ourselves today in full and sympathetic unity with the founders in their loyalty to the Gospel, their exaltation of the Church and its ministry, their reverent habit of searching the Scriptures, their allegiance to the Saviour of the world, their eagerness to give to the uttermost for His sake, and their listening for the whisper of His Spirit's voice. These virtues and graces they wrought into the very fabric of this institution, into its policy of instruction and discipline, into the spirit of its faculty and its student-body, and thence into the careers of its hundreds of alumni throughout the world. These are its life, its character, its personality. These are what God's providence has tended, preserved, enriched. Because they came from Him, they could not be gainsaid or overthrown. Because they point toward Him, they mark out a path of destiny upon which rests the rich light of heaven.

The transfer of the Seminary to Hartford required no little courage. It was forced by the changing conditions of society just after the war. However wise it was to test the establishment of the Seminary in the quiet of a country village, by 1865 it was clear that it could not do its appointed work there. It needed to become part of the complex life of a city, to win friends and supporters on a broader scale, to supply its faculty and students a more stimulating environment, less remote from the busy world. Yet the step was venturesome, and its wisdom remained for a time debatable. The welcome of Hartford can hardly be said to have been general or cordial. The demonstration of what principles of life and what powers of growth there were in the enterprise had yet to be made. So the years in Prospect Street were mostly years of testing and waiting. But gradually they disclosed two notable factors of progress. One of

these was the beginning of that determined and munificent loyalty of certain Hartford citizens from whom came the splendid financial foundation on which all later expansion has rested. The other was the initiation of the educational reconstruction which presently was to raise the Seminary to the front rank in organization and equipment. In the economy of present-day education no institution can fulfill any high destiny without outgrowing the small measures of childhood in both these regards — means and methods.

Dr. Tyler had resigned in 1857, having been President for twenty-four years. During this first quarter of a century his well-known views and his forceful character had naturally dominated the whole policy of the institution. After his withdrawal, and his death in 1858, no one stood exactly in his place, though Dr. Thompson became more than ever the "father" of the Seminary, the center of all its inner life, the closest friend and counselor of all within its circle, and the patient and efficient fulfiller of every sort of duty not otherwise assigned. Prior to 1871 there had never been more than three professors in service at the same time. The two who came down from East Windsor were Drs. Thompson and Vermilye, representing respectively Biblical Studies (primarily the Old Testament) and Systematic Theology. That a new instructional era was now opening, based on a vigorous policy of making the institution adequate for much larger service, and sustained by a new consciousness of ability to find pecuniary support, is shown by the gradual increase of the faculty to what was then regarded as its normal size of five professors. Dr. Bodwell took up the work of Homiletics in 1866, Dr. Schaff soon after began lecturing on Church History, and in 1871 Drs. Riddle and Childs became professors in the New Testament and Church History respectively. To Dr. Vermilye succeeded Dr. Karr in 1876, to Dr. Childs Dr. Hartranft in 1878, and to Dr. Bodwell, after an interval, Dr. Pratt in 1880. In 1880, also, came Dr. Bissell, bringing a fresh impetus in Old Testament work. From 1881 Dr. Thompson no longer served as technically a professor, though his unwearied and beneficent activity as Dean continued unabated till his death in 1889.

Of the forces that started the striking alteration in the edu-

cational system of the Seminary at this time it is hard to speak with certainty. Somewhere in the governing circles there were conspicuous energy, prevision, determination. Not only was the teaching force gradually increased, but the steps of change betokened decided enterprise and wisdom. It was seen that the old machinery was no longer sufficient, but that new men and new methods were demanded. And there was at hand both the will and the ability to devise something larger and more modern. In all this there was doubtless one factor that does not always have its full meed of praise — the pertinacity and liberality of the lay members of the Board of Trustees, who brought to bear on the problems of the Seminary the same vigor that had given them their standing in the business world of Hartford. With this was coupled the zeal of others who had reason to know that more than ever there was place for such an institution as this might be. These administrators were irresistibly impelled to go forward, to build on larger lines, to seek higher efficiencies. This pressure, as they felt, and as we may now see more clearly, was a divine compulsion. Its essential nature is seen, not so much in that it led to ambitious or venturesome plans, but in the quality of the professors that were called, in their willingness to accept the positions offered, in the respect that their coming and their service immediately inspired, and also in the increase in size of the student-body. The first forty classes had averaged only six full graduates per year, the highest number being twelve (in the third class). One year there were no graduates, and twice only one. But, as the meaning of the new policy was perceived, the number began to rise. In 1879 it was 10; in 1883, 14; in 1887, 16; in 1891, 18; and the average number during the fifteen years from 1879 was about double that of the first forty years. The important point just here is that the guardians of the Seminary had not only the daring to project a decided expansion, and not only the skill to inaugurate it, but also the satisfaction of seeing their efforts promptly crowned with some measure of practical success.

I shall not dwell upon the gain in significance and efficiency that resulted from the gift by Mr. Hosmer of our present main building, the cornerstone of which was laid almost exactly thirty years ago. The meaning of this gift, the largest that the insti-

tution had then received, is obvious. Soon after began the long series of princely benefactions from Mr. Case to the library, leading to a metamorphosis there that was simply bewildering. The years from about 1880, also, witnessed a profound alteration in the general attitude of the people of Hartford toward the Seminary. Except within a limited circle, this attitude had not been cordial, partly through an antipathy to the supposed spirit of the institution, partly because it had not demonstrated its right to exist or to grow. But now, as the quality and brotherliness of the faculty came to be known, as the excellence of the student-body came to be felt, and as the material standing of the corporation began to improve with rapidity, a gradual change set in — a change now so far in the past that it is almost forgotten, but one at the time most grateful and inspiring. It is somewhat interesting that one factor in this change is commonly thought to have been the founding and maintenance for many years of the Hosmer Hall Choral Union. But many other influences were at work, some of them hard to define, but none the less potent for good.

We come now to the part of our subject where we should linger more over details. I refer, of course, to the profound reconstruction after about 1880 in the theory and method of our plan of instruction. In the time available it is impossible to do full justice to this. But the salient points can be noted.

An instructional system does not evolve itself. It always results from the thinking of leading men. I have already touched upon the steady infusion of "new blood" into the faculty from 1871 onward. Without pausing to pay fitting tribute to the power and skill of all the new teachers, we may properly single out two examples, both of them happily still living and still bearing fruit.

The long service here of Dr. Riddle, including the sixteen years from 1871 to 1887, exerted a pervasive stimulus upon the pedagogical spirit of the Seminary. Not to mention his other strong qualities, he was both an acute scholar, especially upon textual and exegetical sides, and a peerless teacher, as all who were his pupils will testify. His vivacity and kindling power in

the class-room, his quickening influence on the whole intellectual and spiritual tone of the institution, his honorable service on the American Committee of Revisers, and his abundant work as a writer upon New Testament subjects—all these combined to make him a notable source of strength within and without.

Seven years later came Dr. Hartranft, likewise fresh from an energetic pastorate in the Reformed Church, and already teeming with those grand and sweeping ideas about the scope of theological education that were soon to become the life-blood of progress here.

These two men stand out as the more obvious fountains of new power. But with them were others, to whose minute fidelity in every institutional duty, whose breadth, tact and magnetism as instructors, whose warmth and fullness of spirituality, and whose readiness in affection and helpful friendship much more than this passing tribute of respect and love is due. There was surely an atmosphere in every official and personal relation, permeating the entire life of the Seminary in the years just after 1880, that has never been surpassed since, though it has again and again been approached and perhaps equaled.

What one of us who has known Dr. Hartranft would venture in the space of few or many words to describe the prodigious richness, energy and nobility of the ideas that he brought to Hartford? This side of my duty today would be quite hopeless were it not relieved by the fact that in 1898, when he had completed twenty years of service, the occasion called forth a series of appreciations from many sides, including a careful study by Professor Gillett of his whole relation to the internal organization of the institution.

Dr. Hartranft probably stands to most of us as the most remarkable intellect that we have ever known—capacious, retentive, philosophical, constructive, far-seeing, sublime—filled with an infinite unrest of acquisitiveness, yet always at rest in its sense of the infinite resources of truth and wisdom. There is in him, also, such a wealth of tenderness and sympathy, such instinctive humility and grace, such powers of patience and forbearance, such amplitude of interest and such approachableness, that we tend to think of him not as a grand mountain-peak that looms

distant and alone, but as a great landscape in which one may find a home. And this grandeur of mind and beauty of temper are singularly ennobled by the intensity of his spiritual life, with its abundance of profound experience — some of it far more bitter and pathetic than often falls to the lot of men — with its serenity and strength of faith, with its burning fires of zeal and hope, with its passion for service in every form, with its ecstatic visions of things unseen and heavenly. If there were any connected with the Seminary in the days of which we are speaking who perchance did not come to know him intimately, even they felt the exalting touch of his piety and the glowing impetus of his aspiration. We all came in those days to look up to him — as we did to the more fatherly and less kingly Dr. Thompson — as one of our ideals of Christian character and conduct.

But I must not linger over these memories of Dr. Hartranft as a man and a friend. The question here is as to his impress upon the instructional system of the Seminary.

In the course of his twenty years of active service as teacher here, Dr. Hartranft gave instruction in almost every department. He was originally called to the chair of Church History, but circumstances led him to undertake work, either casually or statedly, in many other fields. He was not only superbly equipped by previous study on all these sides, but he kept up habits of colossal daily research, so that he could rarely be approached on any division of theological scholarship without one's discovering that he was minutely versed in its problems and usually abreast of its latest discussions. This seeming omniscience gave him a mighty hold on the minutiae of the Seminary's instructional system.

It early became evident that his manifold interest was more than mere intellectual avidity. Through it all ran a strenuous plan of construction. For himself, he could not rest until he had reached a rational classification of all theological education and knowledge, arranging what were otherwise an assemblage of separate and even heterogeneous disciplines into one great organism, having a central principle and vital correlation between all its parts. And it was the dream of his life to make such a unified system of thought the framework of instruction in an insti-

tution. Undoubtedly, it was the hope of this that drew him to Hartford. For its realization he wrought patiently and long, not with imperious urgency or with inconsiderate objection to what had been or was, but with infinite kindness and wisdom. It was just ten years after his coming that the formal readjustment of the curriculum took place, which was the first extensive result of his efforts, though various signs of what was in view had been visible long before. To be sure, this particular readjustment was far from embodying his ideas in full, and was felt by him to be only provisional. But for the Seminary, if not for theological education in general, it may truly be said to have marked an epoch.

I use these strong words advisedly, simply to throw emphasis upon an important distinction in thought about theological seminaries which has had a brilliant exemplification here. In the olden days a seminary was understood to be set up to promulgate and defend a particular scheme of views, exegetical and doctrinal. Its *raison d'être* and its final cause were thought to lie in the rightness of these views. How it should be planned or administered educationally was a secondary matter, settled either by custom or by mere expediency. In short, the dominant impulse in its operation was dogmatic and might easily become polemic, if it was not necessarily so. This stress upon specific statements of truth, and upon the moral attitude involved, had advantages and uses, no doubt. But it had also its serious defects and dangers. Fastening its eye upon precise results of thought to be achieved in the student's mind, it might be either simply dictatorial or utterly careless about thoroughness of method, all infelicities of pedagogy being made up by soundness of conviction. Bound to fixed formulæ of statement, it was apt to be distrustful of innovations, hostile to new light, and in the end left behind in the march of intellectual events. That these and similar calamitous consequences of the old theory did actually result is evidenced by the decided popular contempt of theological seminaries as educational agencies which has at times been widespread, traces of which still crop up in the newspapers of today.

In the transformation here of which we are speaking we come face to face with a radically different appraisalment of the work

of a seminary — one changing the emphasis so much that some good friends mistook it for a desertion of all the old ideals. Yet it was carried forward by a faculty every one of whom was explicitly and warmly in sympathy with the general dogmatic position of the founders. It is absolutely futile, therefore, to connect it with any dogmatic declension or disloyalty. It was simply a frank admission that pedagogically and administratively the internal order of the institution needed readjustment, in the interest of scientific truth and for the sake of the dignity of theological science. This readjustment had to be made in all seminaries about the same time. What is peculiar here is the breadth and thoroughness of it, and that it was accomplished without the slightest sense of essential rupture with the past. Animating the whole was the trenchant leadership of Dr. Hartmanft, focalizing the convictions of every member of the teaching force and of the Board of Trustees into a singular unanimity and determination that ushered in the most brilliant period of the Seminary's history, at least up to that time.

One of the outward features of the renovation was the practical adoption of an organic system of encyclopædia or classification of all the topics that were or might be included in the curriculum. No one pretends that a finally satisfactory or ideal system was wrought out or brought into operation. But so much was put in force that an extensive redistribution of the faculty and the curriculum of studies was directly based upon it. It was a strong feature of the policy that all students were carefully indoctrinated in this comprehensive method of thinking, not simply that they might enter into the detail of study here with intelligent alacrity, but that their entire mental life, here and elsewhere, might be enlivened by it. It is true that some outlines and divisions did not at once seem clear to all students. But there were few indeed who were not inspired for their whole life by the noble proportions and perspectives of the edifice of research, reasoning and creative action that was made to rise before them. So long as successive classes came under this influence and every item of the study-routine was dominated by it, there was a mighty impulse to original and energetic thinking in every direction.

It is wholly unnecessary for us to recapitulate the principles

of this system of thought under which the recent development of the Seminary has proceeded. In 1888, when, in the natural course of events, Dr. Hartranft became formally President, he delivered an Inaugural Address which was immediately accepted and has ever since remained as a sort of pedagogical charter or constitution. Coming, as it did, from one competent to speak and one heartily in accord with the convictions of the past, it became without question the basis for advance, in spite of the novelty of its conception of what a seminary is for and how it should work. Its tremendous emphasis upon the dignity of the topics with which theology has to do and of theology itself as "the absolute head of all sciences"; its vigorous assertion both of the right and the duty of a seminary to undertake the most elaborate functions of research, education and publication; its suggestions as to the analysis along fresh lines of the field of theological education, and as to the motives and purposes that should control in it; its magnifying of the need of generating in students powers of original thought and leadership much more than of simply coaching them in the repetition of certain accepted formulæ and programs; and its hints of how immense was the array of practical agencies, organizations and movements with which a live theological seminary should actively and organically connect itself — these are a few of the items in this truly majestic address. In the adoption of these ideals of conviction and effort was consummated the transition of method that differentiates the new Seminary from the old. The change was indeed a revolution, though never felt for a moment to be a destructive one. The great realities of Christian faith and hope to be exalted remained absolutely in the center of the Seminary's life, though for educational purposes they were approached in many new ways and with a new ardor. The institution simply attained a larger and more mature stage in its natural and predestined evolution. And it now came into infinitely more effective contact with various lines of Christian enterprise than had previously been considered possible.

Another outward step of great moment was the steady increase in the size of the faculty. This was the result of two compulsions — on the one hand the advance of theological spe-

cialties themselves, each requiring expert handling; and, on the other, the rapid subdivision of functions among Christian workers, each clamoring for a preparation somewhat peculiar to itself. No seminary now can fill its place or hold its own without going far beyond the old standard of perhaps five professorial chairs. The subdivision here has not yet been carried as far as it ought to be, but it is significant that the resident faculty is now three times that of thirty years ago, without counting numerous instructors and lecturers. The order of the steps was somewhat accidental. In 1881 the Practical Department was enlarged to include Music and Hymnology as connected with Public Worship; in 1883 the Library was fully recognized as a distinct branch of the instructional system; in 1885 Elocution was set off by itself, and the Lectureship on Foreign Missions was founded; in 1888 the Systematic Department was enriched by a separate chair of Apologetics, allowing for the adequate presentation of philosophical subjects; in 1889 came the first partition of the Historical Department, and the specialty of Experiential Theology was recognized; in 1890 Biblical Theology was differentiated, Dr. Hartranft himself being transferred to it the next year; in 1892 the Historical Department was again subdivided, making it relatively the best organized in the institution; and in 1892, also, came the long-needed separation of the linguistic side of the Old Testament work from its critical and historical side. I break off my enumeration of changes at this point simply because it was about here—in 1892 or 1893—that the present faculty attained substantially the form that it has since kept, six of the present professors being added to the staff between 1891 and 1893.

What has just been said about the successive new assignments of the faculty gives but the slenderest hint of the enormous alterations in curriculum details, and of the gradual fusing of these details into a unified whole. I sometimes wonder whether ever again we shall know a time more interesting than the ten years from 1885 to 1895, for then the entire faculty was constantly engaged upon curriculum questions. Though the President's leadership was always felt, it was never his policy or practice to dictate action or to anticipate the free decision of the

whole faculty. Usually his voice was the last to be heard, if heard at all. Thus was developed a faculty *esprit de corps*, as well as a general expertness in administrative technique, that is a prime reason for the unexcelled pedagogical success of that particular decade. Interwoven with this was the intimate knowledge of every professor's and every student's work that the President gained and held, largely in consequence of his habit of spending practically the whole of each day at the Seminary.

I dwell upon these two points of organization—the evolution of a new curriculum and the creation of a new faculty—because at the time they were of critical importance. But many other powerful factors in the progress of the period merit much more attention than our time today permits.

Back of the animated and complicated activity of the faculty lay the less obvious, but necessary and laborious work of the Board of Trustees, facing the serious problem of financing a steadily expanding instructional system. Of the details of this work nothing can be said here. But surely none of us can withhold his tribute of admiration from these faithful and courageous custodians, as they sought to conserve the resources of the treasury at the same time that they were sanctioning steps that were making each year's budget more difficult. As has been noted earlier in our survey, this Seminary has been most fortunate in its legal body of administrators, both clerical and lay. They have been men of insight and foresight, of faith and fortitude, of patience and persistence. Without their strong hand of support and guidance nothing of all the progress that we are chronicling would have been possible.

And, on the other side of the faculty's activity, lay the fine body of students whom the new policies drew to Hartford. The total number in the regular course (excluding graduates and special students) reached 57 in 1890, and, after an interval, touched the same number in 1898, and then mounted to 63, 62, 66, and 61 in the four years following. Mere numbers, however, do not necessarily signify. The true tests are the impression of the undergraduate work and life from week to week, and the still more telling record in later years of those who graduate. Of this aspect of the Seminary's history we are having today five

careful summaries from other annalists. To these I need add only the assurance of the continuous and affectionate interest with which we of the faculty follow the unfolding of character, ability and consecrated efficiency of every individual student from his coming here through every stage of his later career. We are proud, and justly proud, of our great circle of alumni. The latest list of those whose addresses are known includes over 550 names. Some 480 of these are working in 37 states of the Union, 260 of them in New England, 74 in the middle states, 78 in the interior, 53 in the far West, and 15 in the South, while 75 are scattered through some 25 foreign countries, especially in Turkey, China and Japan. Hartford, then, has supplied a significant battalion to the army of organized and aggressive Christianity, and it has the right to rejoice and exult in the manifold and incalculable achievements that this force has been enabled to win.

In this connection may I insert one more piece of statistics? For forty-five years the Seminary drew its students from about twenty-five colleges, nine-tenths of them from these seven: Amherst, 41 per cent.; Williams, 22 per cent.; Yale, 14 per cent.; Dartmouth, 6 per cent.; Union, Bowdoin and Brown, each about 2.3 per cent. During the last thirty years it has drawn from nearly ninety colleges in all, with Amherst still much in the lead (17 per cent.), followed, in this order, by Williams, Dartmouth, Princeton, Oberlin, Yale, Carleton, Wesleyan, Harvard, Mt. Holyoke, Brown, the University of Michigan, and some thirty others, before the nine-tenths point is reached. In the first list, out of about 350 students, only 26 came from colleges outside of New England. In the second list, out of 500 students, 277 came from New England colleges and 223 from elsewhere. Both sides of this last statement are significant.

There is a long list of special movements or events during the last quarter-century upon which much might and should be said. Among these are the opening of our doors to women students in 1889, which has already added 24 accomplished and efficient members to our roll of graduates, six of them being on the foreign field and as many more in posts of peculiar educational responsibility in the homeland; the adoption in 1891 of a

full system of electives, affording room for specialization in an unprecedented number of directions, though with safeguards against some dangers; the promotion of post-graduate study by means of prize Fellowships for foreign study, that known by the name of William Thompson being founded in 1887, that of John S. Welles in 1890, and those in memory of Porter Ogden Jacobus recently added in 1905 (these latter being for resident study); the altogether exceptional emphasis on systematic instruction in subjects connected with Missions, taking shape about 1885, and now extended to several special undertakings, of which the Hartford-Lamson Lectures on The Religions of the World is the most conspicuous; the also exceptional emphasis upon Religious Pedagogy made possible since 1901 by the affiliation with the Seminary of the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy; the portentous growth of the Library from about 8,000 volumes thirty years ago, ill-assorted, uncatalogued and poorly classified, to its present size of over 90,000 volumes and almost 50,000 pamphlets, superbly arranged and administered in a specially convenient building of its own, making it one of the finest theological libraries in the world; the deposit here of the great missionary and ethnological Museum of the American Board, which, with our own enlarging collections, constitutes one of the striking single features of our present equipment; the establishment in 1890 of the HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD, an important periodical, now in its nineteenth volume; not to speak of many other matters of hardly less significance. As one runs over this hasty catalogue of momentous accumulations of vitality and power, he can hardly avoid both an amused and a tender reflection as to how these magnificent facilities and these far-reaching enterprises would impress one of the founders or early friends of the Seminary, if he could step from the scanty measures of East Windsor Hill into our midst today.

Though this is not an address upon the theory and policy of theological seminaries in general, a brief reference to a few points is in order, since their consideration as regards this particular Seminary belongs to the history that we are reviewing. For more than thirty years the governing boards of this institution

have been scrutinizing the field of theological education in America to discern both "the signs of the times" in general and the special tokens of destiny for Hartford. Some conclusions have emerged that are matters of history.

One of these is that it is not the mission of this Seminary to engage in public controversies or to champion particular views in a controversial spirit. Its teachers are expected to keep themselves informed upon current happenings in the world of thought, to reach opinions about them in a cool and philosophic manner, and, within their own professional fields, to teach fearlessly what they believe to be true, right and wise. It is even desirable that in the faculty somewhat varying attitudes of mind should be represented, so that more than one set of scientific methods should be considered possible and more than one way of stating results. It is eminently undesirable that the institution as such should officially advocate views on which there is manifest room for rational differences of opinion. Cases might be cited in recent years where this Seminary has been urged thus to become a partisan. In all these it has declined to act corporately, though granting full liberty to its officers to act individually as they saw fit. Happily, throughout its whole history it has proceeded under a creed which was surprisingly well drawn in all essential points. This has never been felt to impose any burdensome limitation upon desirable freedom of instruction.

Another point is that the business of this Seminary is not scientific or scholastic in any exclusive sense, but eminently practical. It is the creation of the churches, and its object is to serve the churches. Its existence implies that scholarship is demanded in the modern ministry, now more than ever, yet not scholarship for its own sake, but for the sake of practical results. Here, of course, is one of the dangers of any institution of higher learning. Such learning must be directed by those who have the appetites and ambitions of strenuous scholastic research in a high degree. But in the play of these intense intellectual forces it is obvious that here the dominant motive must always be a passion for the advancement of the Kingdom of God through the agencies of the organized Church. Hence every detail of policy and discipline must show itself to be dictated by a sanely practical

purpose. And the test of success is to be found in the quality of practical leadership that its graduates display.

This is one of several reasons why Hartford Seminary believes that there must always be place for a seminary that is not imbedded in the complex system of a university, which, in these days, at least, no longer consciously derives its being from the churches or has the needs of the churches as a principal goal of endeavor. We have no quarrel with seminaries thus affiliated. They have their work, and often they cannot well be other than what they have become. But no one need object to our going our way differently. We too have our work, marked out, we believe, by providential guidance, and manifestly capable of much beneficent result. The history of the past makes us confident that there is a sure future for those seminaries that can remain unentangled in social, intellectual and spiritual environments not organically related with the actual life of the church.

Still another point is that we here have come to believe more strongly than ever that now there is an insistent call that preparation for the ministry shall be made more rigorous and extensive rather than less so. This means that it shall be preceded by nothing less than a full four-years' course of collegiate study; that the seminary curriculum shall not be diminished or diluted or dissipated, but expanded, intensified and exalted as becomes a specialty, even if ultimately it also takes four years instead of the traditional three; and that all students be pressed to magnify their calling by aspiring to a discipline that shall make them genuine captains in thought and service. There may possibly be reasons in rare cases for "telescoped" courses of study, for "short cuts," for limited or narrowly specialized lines of training. But this Seminary has stood and is ambitious to stand for something higher and better. And the experience of the last decades seems to show that in our denomination there is place for such an institution.

And still again. We here know no moated rampart that sets off the castle of spirituality in majestic isolation from the varied land of common life and common work — mental, social, commercial, political. Spirituality is not a department of human life among other departments. It is not a mysterious room into

which at intervals elect souls retire, and from which they emerge, closing the door behind them, when they proceed to live. No — spirituality is a habit of the whole life, an atmosphere in which every power and faculty is exercised, a vision that shines through every experience, a motive power that charges every energy. Hence in our thought about the life and work here we have no separate place for the cultivation of spirituality. Its pursuit and its experience, we assume, are involved in every occupation and incident of our daily institutional existence. The primary question for every instructor and student at every hour and in every act is whether, as spiritual beings, we are in living contact with the divine Spirit in such a way that He is working in and through us. If not, we have no business here unless we can find the lost contact. If so, then we have the inner witness of those who are living in the presence and the fellowship of the Almighty. What more can we ask?

And now, as I bring this long survey to a close, how shall I give a final word of greeting, not only to you who are here gathered to renew the old comradeships, but to that greater circle of unseen presences that seem to surround our assemblage today? Of the twenty-four Trustees who were in office when I came to Hartford, not one remains upon the Board, and all but four are dead. During the years since 1882 I have been associated in greater or less intimacy with over forty-five professors and regular instructors, of whom thirteen are dead and seventeen are now at work elsewhere. And I have had the privilege of knowing about 550 students in the regular course, most of whom are now on our roll of graduates. If this were a personal address instead of an official one, I should have attempted in some way to pay due tribute to the fragrant memory of those who have passed from this earthly life into the heavenly, as well as to express the admiration and love with which I follow those now in service throughout the length and breadth of this great land of ours, or scattered here and there in other lands. There are few in this whole large army of Hartford men and women whom I do not clearly individualize in my thought, and none whom I do not follow with a hearty personal interest and hope. There is nothing

peculiar about my feeling. It is warmly shared by all who bear office here. We know ourselves to be knit together by ties of no common fibre and texture. For the life of an institution is by no means to be found wholly in its official structure, or in its government and instruction, or in its policy and outward course of development. That life more truly consists in the manifold lives which from time to time are built into its fabric, sometimes as benefactors, sometimes as administrators, sometimes as teachers, sometimes as students. Who shall say in any one year, or in any series of years, which class of these personal elements contributes the most? No one can question that it is the personal factor that counts, here much more than in some other relations. This, I take it, is a dominant note in the fresh development of the Seminary's life that is now going forward under the magnetic leadership of President Mackenzie, the full fruits of which, as I said at the outset, it will be the privilege of your next anniversary historian to summarize and celebrate.

The one great thought which this hour of memory leaves with us is that with which we began—that in the whole history of Hartford Seminary there has been conspicuously displayed a mighty, continuous, unfolding force. This vitalizing principle is the indwelling, pervading, directive personal presence of the Most High God. It was His hand that launched this institution so long ago, and that has guided it, like a staunch and gallant ship, through all the decades since. Some of those who have here wrought in fellowship with Him He has made to shine as stars in the firmament of His kingdom. Upon all who have come within this circle has been exerted some measure of His infinite truth, grace and power. To Him alone must we give thanks for all the marvelous blessings of the past and the present. And today, as we seem to stand upon the deck of this stately ship, with our faces toward the fresh winds of the future, and behold the years coming to meet us like the great billows of the ocean, we know, so long as it is kept and guided by the counsels of the Eternal Father, as manifested in Him who is for all men and all time the Prince and Captain of salvation, and interpreted by the perpetual ministry of His Spirit in our hearts, not only that all the

interests of this Seminary which we hold most dear are safe, but that, through the divine grace, they will be crowned with an accumulating glory.

ROLL OF PROFESSORS AND STATED INSTRUCTORS

Name	Date	Department
Bennet Tyler, . . .	1834-1857 (d. 1858)	Systematics
Jonathan Cogswell, . .	1834-1844 (d.)	History
William Thompson, . .	1834-1881 (d. 1889)	Old Testament
Edward W. Hooker, . .	1844-1848 (d. 1875)	Homiletics
Nahum Gale, . . .	1851-1853 (d. 1876)	History
Edward A. Lawrence, . .	1854-1865 (d. 1883)	History
Robert G. Vermilye, . .	1858-1875 (d. 1875)	Systematics
Joseph C. Bodwell, . .	1866-1873 (d. 1876)	Homiletics
Matthew B. Riddle, . .	1871-1887	New Testament
Thomas S. Childs, . . .	1871-1878	History
William S. Karr, . . .	1876-1888 (d. 1888)	Systematics
Chester D. Hartranft, . .	1878-1903	History, Systematics
Clark S. Beardslee, . .	1879-1881	Old Testament
Henry H. Kelsey, . . .	1879-1882	Elocution
Lewellyn Pratt, . . .	1880-1888	Homiletics
Edwin C. Bissell, . . .	1880-1892 (d. 1894)	Old Testament
William W. Sleeper, . .	1881-1882	Music
Waldo S. Pratt, . . .	1882-	Music, Hymnology
Ernest C. Richardson, . .	1883-1890	Librarian
Frederick C. Robertson, . .	1885-1888	Elocution
Andrew C. Zenos, . . .	1887-1891	New Testament
Graham Taylor, . . .	1888-1892	Homiletics, Sociology
Clark S. Beardslee, . .	1888-	Systematics, Homiletics
Arthur L. Gillett, . . .	1888-	Apologetics
Williston Walker, . . .	1889-1901	History
Charles S. Nash, . . .	1889-1891	Elocution, Systematics
Alfred T. Perry, . . .	1890-1900	Librarian
Melancthon W. Jacobus, . .	1891-	New Testament
Charles M. Mead, . . .	1892-1898	Systematics
Edwin K. Mitchell, . . .	1892-	History
Alexander R. Merriam, . .	1892-	Homiletics, Sociology
Lewis B. Paton, . . .	1892-	Old Testament
Duncan B. Macdonald, . .	1892-	Old Testament
Cecil Harper, . . .	1894-1901	Elocution
Edward E. Nourse, . . .	1895-	Biblical Theology
Curtis M. Geer, . . .	1900-	History
Stephen T. Livingston, . .	1901-1903	Elocution
Charles S. Thayer, . . .	1902-	Librarian
Samuel Simpson, . . .	1902-1909	History
William D. Mackenzie, . .	1903-	Systematics
Calvin C. Thomas, . . .	1904-1905	Elocution
Austin B. Bassett, . . .	1905-	Experiential Theology
John W. Wetzel, . . .	1905-	Elocution

RECOLLECTIONS OF AN OLD GRADUATE

Among the various communications sent on the occasion, a letter by Rev. Samuel B. Forbes of the Class of '57 was read by Dr. L. H. Hallock, '66. It contains such a vivid picture of the physical conditions, intellectual life and social relations characteristic of the early Seminary that the larger part of it is here included.

"I was not on the ground exactly fifty years ago, but about those days. The Theological Institute of Connecticut was at East Windsor Hill, on the Hartford and Springfield turnpike, a road of deep sand in dry weather and deep mud in rainy weather. Approach from the east was by a common meadow road; approach from the west always presented the problem of crossing the Connecticut River and a broad meadow often flooded. We had a 'swing ferry' which was out of commission when the water was too high, or too low. If the river was accommodating, a tin horn hanging from a post might be blown, and if the ferryman heard it he would appear sooner or later—usually later, and if the water was propitious the crossing might at length be accomplished—but not always.

"The steam railroad would land us at Hartford or at Warehouse Point, on the turnpike, from which we could make our way as best we could to East Windsor Hill. Evidently the founders intended to hold the students steadily to their tasks and in their place.

"The plant included a few acres of land on which students might indulge in practical agriculture: for some of our men were willing to dig, though not willing to beg,—for their education."

Mr. Forbes then describes the dormitories, Deacon Ellsworth's thrift in care of firewood, etc., etc., and adds, "Three men constituted our Faculty, viz.: Dr. Tyler, Dr. Thompson and Dr. Lawrence. They were all righteous men, walking in all the commandments of the Lord,—as they understood them,—blameless.

"Dr. Tyler settled our Theology as taught by the Holy Scriptures. He was the leader of a Theological School. It pained him because others could not see the truth as he saw it; earnestly he prayed for those who could not accept his creed. Having been a pastor, a college president, and a close student of King James's translation of the Scriptures, he could give chapter and verse which were satisfactory proof texts for him and he thought ought to be sufficient for others. If he had an idol, it was the Theological Institute of Connecticut.

"Dr. Thompson was our Hebrew scholar and teacher. He was also our Greek scholar and teacher. More than that, he was our teacher of English, and every inch a gentleman. A man of marked and beautiful character—everybody's friend;—his social qualities were an uplift to every student. His 'Good Morning' and hand-grip would be a fine specimen of Dr. Worcester's unprofessional medicament. Of course his daughters were captured by the students.

"Dr. Lawrence was our philosopher. He led us through Church History. His select rhetoric and musical voice gave him full benches when he lectured. Once he gave us a course of lectures on German Philosophy; the course was exceedingly interesting, if not intelligible. We took notes according to the best of our ability. I have lost the notes, but I can

remember one, only one, sentence of the whole course. This is it: 'The Infinite posits the Finite'; or,—perhaps it was, 'The Finite posits the Infinite!' However, we are grateful to Dr. Lawrence for his royal effort to give us a taste of German Philosophy.

"I have already spoken of Dr. Thompson: I wish to add the interesting fact that Dr. Thompson's entire family was to the Seminary a social force of inestimable value. At times Mrs. Thompson would spread her table for the entire body of students, feed them well, and follow the spread with an hour of delightful conversation, story and song.

"Much more might be said of the Seminary life at East Windsor Hill, but one more word must be said: You may think that early experience at the little School of the Prophets little more than valueless, but mark you, that little Theological Institute of Connecticut was the root from which has grown the institution which now holds a noble position among the schools, not only of this country but of the world, The Hartford Theological Seminary."

Signed,

SAMUEL B. FORBES.

HARTFORD SEMINARY ALUMNI IN FOREIGN MISSIONS.

BY REVEREND JAMES L. BARTON, D.D.

The strength and worth of a school of theology is not measured by the magnificence of its building, the size and renown of its faculty, the comprehensiveness of its curriculum or the number of its students, but by the achievements of its graduates. The theological seminary exists only for the Church, and the church is a missionary institution pure and simple. The Church is not organized primarily for worship or for instruction, but to make Jesus Christ and His saving grace known to the world, and that is Missions. This service, beginning at the altar of the Church itself, must extend and continue until the last child upon the frontier of civilization has seen and recognized Him as Redeemer and Lord.

We are to consider that part of Hartford Seminary's service to the Church which has to do with the great world lying outside our own borders, where, all agree, the need is supreme and the opportunity boundless. I would not claim that the value of a seminary's work is measured only by those who have entered foreign missionary service. Far be it from me to make such a

claim. But I am bold to affirm that when students in a theological seminary are sufficiently indoctrinated with the expulsive power of a universal gospel to drive them beyond the borders of their native town and state, beyond the bounds of our material civilization into the West and South and the slums of our great cities, and across the seas and the islands and the continents until the two currents of forthgoing apostles meet upon the other side of the globe, — then such a seminary possesses that dynamic power which the living Christ invariably imparts. When a seminary fails to accomplish this, it is destitute of spiritual power.

Hartford Seminary has never failed to demonstrate by the going forth of its graduates that its gospel is broad and living. It is not my purpose, did time and space permit, to read the long and illustrious list of those who have thus gone forth, not a few of whom have laid down their lives in the cause they went out to serve. As far as general statistics are concerned it may suffice to record that of the graduates of this seminary since 1835, 81 have entered the foreign missionary service, while nine others, who did not graduate from this seminary, but were for a period regular students here, are in the same list. It is interesting to note that 62 of these went out in the last thirty-four years, and 33 in the last twelve years. "The gospel for the world" is not a lost gospel to this seminary. It was never more emphasized than at the present time. Fifty-three graduates of this seminary are living and laboring today as missionaries in Bohemia, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Southern and Western India, in Ceylon and Burmah, in five provinces of China, Korea, in Natal, Portuguese West Africa and Rhodesia; in three of the four main islands of Japan, Yezo, Hondu and Kiushiu; in Guam and the Hawaiian Islands; in Jamaica and in Mexico, while two are secretaries of the American Board in Boston. It can truthfully be said that the sun never sets upon the labors of students of Hartford Seminary; that always somewhere in the world men and women of Hartford are personally engaged in the work of the Kingdom. In addition to the graduates of this seminary who have received appointment as missionaries by a foreign mission board, there are also several students from India, Japan, Persia, and Turkey

who have, since graduation, returned to their respective countries, and are there a force for intelligent righteousness.

It is through these 90 representatives of the seminary abroad that this institution has exerted its widest and most vital influence upon the Kingdom of God on earth. It is at this point that Hartford Seminary has come into the broadest contact with the world. Graduates of this seminary are today in 15 of the great nations of the earth, whose total population exceeds 900,000,000, and in order to do the work for which they were sent out, these alumni have mastered, and now use as their own tongue, 26 different languages, which are spoken by over 500,000,000 immortal beings. These languages include the Mandarin and several other languages of China, Japanese, Korean, two of the great India languages, the Tamil and the Marathi, all of the principal languages of Turkey, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Arabia and Egypt, Burmese, Spanish, the languages spoken upon several of the Pacific Islands, besides Bohemian and German. The achievement of the apostles upon the day of Pentecost is today far exceeded by the students in this seminary, who are able to teach and preach the gospel of Christ to these many races and peoples, so that 500,000,000 can say, "Now hear we every man in our own language wherein we were born."

Fifty-nine of these 90 former students in this seminary might be designated as "general missionaries," although hardly one of the entire number has not specialized, as occasion demanded, in some one or more departments of service. The "general missionary" is an organizer, an evangelist, a church builder, a leader and inspirer of native forces, a shaper of the new social order that Christianity is producing in the East, a creator of a national and racial consciousness, and a forerunner of the Kingdom of God among the nations. These Hartford men have, in co-operation with others, mapped out the lands of the East, decided upon the strategic centres to be occupied, planned for the Christian institutions called for by the local conditions, met and turned aside persecutions, established the bases of supply, fixed the policies for work, and in fine these are the men and women who have opened the way into the centres of population and influence among the Eastern and African, as

well as other needy races, and have so established their institutions of Christianity that no power upon earth can uproot them. While we at home have been busy with our little routine of duties touching a few individuals, they have been dealing with nations.

As already stated, it was imperative that some of these should become specialists as the exigencies of the work demanded. Eleven of the graduates of this seminary have had and now have official connection with six Christian collegiate institutions in the East, while as many more have been at the head of preparatory schools. These are the institutions that have trained and are now training the men who are to pilot the Eastern races out into the broad seas of a common Christian civilization. The principles of this seminary are entering into the life and thought, beliefs and aspirations, of these other nations where they will be transmitted through succeeding generations. These men are not deceived into believing that education in itself can make a nation or a race good or truly great, but they do believe, and it is a belief received within these very walls, that true piety and sound learning, twin forces for righteousness, constitute in themselves a power strong enough to sweep evil passion and ignorance, twin forces of destruction, from the face of the earth and usher in that day of universal love and peace for which we pray.

The higher educational institutions with which the alumni of this seminary are connected, are located in Burmah, Turkey, Japan, China, India, and Mexico, and the influence of the work there done is mightier than can ever be measured by any system of statistics or reports.

Let us glance at the work of but a single group of these apostles of righteousness, intelligence, and civilization in their unbounded world field and among the millions of the belated races. Take the name of Josiah Tyler, who went into South Africa in 1849. Read the story of the development of that Zulu race, the Anglo-Saxons of Africa, the reduction of their language to writing, their gradual emergence from the darkness of paganism, as those twin institutions of the gospel, the church and school, took hold upon their intellects and recreated their

lives. Go through the story of that forty years among that greatest African race,—and then know the reason why, upon two continents at least, Dr. Bennett Tyler would be more widely known as the father of Josiah Tyler, the missionary to Natal, than he is or ever will be known as the first president of this seminary.

To this add the illustrious names of Wilder, Rood, Robbins, and Pixley, and then point out any five names of graduates of this seminary who have ever lived between the two seas, the breadth, importance and permanence of whose life labors can for a moment be compared with this quintette of apostles to the Zulus.

It might be invidious to present the names of graduates of this seminary who are now in the active work abroad, but I am sure I am well within the limits of moderation when I say that they are the worthy successors of the long line of illustrious pioneers who boldly fared forth into the unknown in the earlier days of modern missions, and there toiled until the mysteries of the East have been penetrated, and the best in our civilization and our religion is there becoming naturalized.

In these days, with the ink hardly dry upon the widespread pages of our daily press, upon which have been graphically told the story of the barbaric slaughter of Christians in Cilicia, Turkey, both races spurred on by national hatreds and religious fanaticism, one speaking in this presence and upon such an occasion, cannot but pause to mention the names of D. Miner Rogers and Stephen V. R. Trowbridge. Through circumstances over which they could have no control, these two recent graduates of this seminary found themselves, a few days since, in the midst of raging and warring multitudes infuriated by a mad passion for blood. Read the story of their self-forgetfulness as they moved amid fire and fury and death, seeking only for means to stay the infuriated passions of the frenzied throng, and provide safety for the thousands of helpless, homeless refugees who sought their protection. See them as they mount upon the roof of that academy filled with girls and defenseless women, pleading with the mob, who stand with loaded rifles pointed at their heads, that they cease their mad onslaught and

listen to the voice of reason and of God. Look again at Rogers lying dead in the street with a Moslem bullet through his heart, and his life blood mingling with the crimson stream flowing from a hundred Moslem and Christian dead. Then follow Trowbridge after removing the girls to a place of greater safety, boldly threading his way amid the raging throng through those narrow streets, almost choked with the bodies of the dying and the dead, to the administration building, and there, of the chief magistrate of the Vilayet, demanding help in the name of the slain Rogers, and securing an armed guard to return with him to the mission premises, to force back those who were bent upon making it a slaughter pen. And the station was saved.

Who would not rather be a Trowbridge or a Rogers, who counted not their lives dear unto themselves but, in the face of need and of duty, advanced unflinching into the hell of a Turkish massacre, than to hold the highest place the Church can offer in all this land where Christian sacrifice is little known, and where love of ease and luxury eats like a canker at the heart of our consecration?

At the same time our thoughts turn to Thurston and Seabury, who as truly gave their lives for China as did the apostles of old. As we dwell upon the memory of the sacrifices students of this seminary have made and are making in the broad world-field, we are conscious of an impulse to stand with bowed head in the presence of the Eternal and pray that something of their devotion and self-forgetfulness may come upon us who dwell in safety in a land filled with plenty.

Hartford Seminary, through its missionaries abroad, has in a peculiar manner perpetuated its ideas and ideals in schools for ministerial training in North China, in South China, in Armenia, in Mesopotamia and in Anatolia, all in Turkey; in East, West and South Africa; and in Japan,—in nine different institutions. A theological seminary reaches the height of achievement when, through its graduates, it can multiply itself in the uttermost parts of the earth. Men come and go, but institutions abide. It is impossible even to estimate the number of well equipped men in the countries above mentioned, who

have caught their first vision of the meaning of consecration to the Christian ministry from students of this seminary, and who there have obtained a balanced view of Biblical and historic Christianity, under whose guidance and inspiration they have gone out to organize churches, regenerate the society of the East and to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in at least eleven different languages, and spoken by six times as many people as there are in the entire United States today.

Neither time or space will permit of our following in detail the various lines of work pursued by our representatives abroad; they have taken medical courses and practice healing of the body as well as of the mind and soul; they have conducted large literary operations both within and without their mission fields; they have been organizers and promoters of industrial enterprises, as they have planned to minister to the entire man; they have been leaders in the organization of a new social order; they have been the counsellors of rulers, and have co-operated with local officials in the interests of good government, general education and better sanitation; they have shown themselves everywhere to be the true friends of all men, in all classes of society and in all conditions of need. If the people to whom they went had no written language they have proceeded to supply that need; if they had no text books for their schools, Hartford men made them; if they needed wholesome and civilized houses in which to dwell, our men taught them how to construct such; if better implements for agricultural purposes were needed the missionaries made or imported them, and then taught the people how to use them. Not less than half a dozen graduates of this seminary have been or now are engaged in the translation or in the revision of the Bible in six of the languages used in mission countries. The graduates of this seminary who have entered upon the science of foreign missions have not followed any one fixed path, but they have literally been all things to all men, and by the grace of God they have been and are winning multitudes to a saving knowledge of Christ.

Hartford Seminary has rendered a large service in this country by the men and women it has equipped for positions of wide usefulness in the churches and in the many institutions

with which they have been and are connected. Not for a moment would I attempt to minimize the importance of what they are doing. But I must say that for wide vision, world grasp, infinite reach and divine example, we must look to those who stand amid the awakening, seething, eager races of the East, where a man's senses are made doubly alert and a man's nerves are steeled for mighty achievements, and a man's heart is made to glow by the demonstrations he sees upon every side that the gospel of Jesus Christ is the gospel for all men and all races, and that upon its platform the divergent nations of earth will yet stand together in a common brotherhood as they serve one common God and Father.

HARTFORD ALUMNI IN HOME MISSIONS.

BY REVEREND HENRY H. KELSEY.

To ascertain and define the influence of a theological seminary in any field of Christian service, is practically impossible. To estimate and measure what its Alumni have accomplished for the Kingdom in the field of Home Missions is peculiarly difficult. If we should limit our inquiry and estimate to their work in what we may call technical Home Missions, or to the work of those men who have been under commission from the Home Missionary Society, it would be, in even that case, impossible to approach accuracy and fulness of statement. For it is impossible from available records to know what these distinctively Home Missionaries have done.

To do well the thing you have asked me to do would require an immense amount of research, and such an acquaintance with the personal history of our 900 Alumni and the 200 or 300 others who have studied here, as I do not possess and have not had time to gain. I have, however, gathered some information, the substance of which I will give you.

First: Some facts regarding the men who have worked within the field of Home Missions proper, who have been under

commission of the National or a State Home Missionary Society, whom we may list as Home Missionaries in the technical sense. Using the resources within my reach I find the names of 372 men most of whom are graduates of Hartford; a few were students for one or more years and did not graduate.

These 372 men have served in 584 places in 34 States, as follows:

State.	Men.	Town.
Alabama,	1	1
Arizona,	2	2
Arkansas,	1	3
California,	12	27
Colorado,	13	13
Connecticut,	31	43
Florida,	4	7
Georgia,	1	1
Idaho,	2	2
Illinois,	9	10
Indiana,	5	5
Iowa,	16	21
Kansas,	7	15
Maine,	35	59
Massachusetts,	46	67
Michigan,	7	8
Minnesota,	30	56
Nebraska,	14	16
New Hampshire,	21	27
New York,	21	32
New Mexico,	1	1
Nevada,	4	7
North Dakota,	11	21
Ohio,	5	6
Oklahoma,	1	1
Oregon,	3	11
Rhode Island,	4	9
South Carolina,	1	1
South Dakota,	12	32
Texas,	1	1
Utah,	5	5
Vermont,	39	54
Washington,	7	10
Wisconsin,	6	10
	<hr/> 372	<hr/> 584

Now that tells a story upon which comment seems almost superfluous.

If one could estimate the sum total of the work and influence of these men he would thereby have one measure of the contribution of Hartford Seminary to Home Missions.

To help to this estimate I am able to give you a few facts concerning what some individuals have done.

The first upon our roll of honor is the name of CUSHING EELS of the Class of 1837, a pioneer of pioneers. In 1810, the year of his birth, there were only 63 Congregational Churches west of New England, and in 1825, the year of his conversion, there was not a single Congregational Church west of Ohio. Upon graduating from the seminary Mr. Eels was ordained as a Missionary to the heathen, being under appointment of the American Board as a Missionary to the Indians in Oregon. Accompanied by his bride he started at once for his field, journeying across the continent from Missouri on horseback. For ten years he worked with the Indians near Spokane until the mission was abandoned. Then for twelve years he taught in schools and academies in Washington and Oregon, one of them being at Forest Grove, where he helped to found Pacific University.

In 1861 he was appointed by the American Board agent to sell its property at Walla Walla, 640 acres. When he came to stand upon the spot made sacred by the blood of Marcus Whitman he felt that it would be a sacrilege to sell it and leave no monument of Whitman's heroism and sacrifice. So he bought the land himself, planted it with his own hands, and when it was paid for gave one-half of it to found Whitman College. Thus, besides all the other ways in which this man lived himself into the beginnings of those two great States—his name will always be associated with two colleges. Of Whitman he was the real founder. He gave the land, secured the charter, put up the first building, served as the first teacher, became President of the Board of Trustees and was its friend and benefactor to the end of his long life.

Of others we may not recount so much. There is but one Father Eels on our list. His son, MYRON EELS, of the Class of 1871, began his ministry at Boise City, Idaho, and has since been one of the efficient Home Missionaries in the region of his birth.

EDWARD WRIGHT of the Class of 1839, was, never, so far

as I can learn, in the employ of the Home Missionary Society, but his work belongs in this recital. Upon his graduation he went at once into missionary work at St. Louis. In 1843 he became pastor of a church in western Missouri. After six years he became a missionary pastor in St. Louis. From 1863 to 1888 he was District Superintendent of the American Bible Society for Missouri. He gave his last report upon his eightieth birthday, when he resigned. During that last year he had traveled 24,467 miles, visited 80 auxiliaries, attended 37 anniversaries, visited 20 ecclesiastical bodies, sent 440 official letters, distributed 5,450 official documents and delivered 139 addresses and sermons. He died in Seattle a few days before his ninety-third birthday.

FRANKLIN B. DOE was a member of the Class of 1854 for one year. After a ten years' pastorate at Appleton, Wis., he became Home Missionary Superintendent for Wisconsin, which office he held for 25 years, and laid down this charge to take up the harder work of being Home Missionary Superintendent for 7 years, of Texas, Arkansas, Missouri and Oklahoma.

HIRAM NICHOLAS GATES, of the Class of 1850, has an honored place in this record. He was ordained as a Home Missionary at East Windsor Hill, August 3, 1850, and went at once to Iowa, where he labored for 12 years. He returned to Connecticut and held pastorates in Barkhamsted and Northfield for eight years. Then he became General Missionary of northern Minnesota for two years. This work he resigned to accept the office of Home Missionary Superintendent for Nebraska, which position he held until he came to Connecticut to live with his invalid wife. His name is perpetuated in Gates College at Neligh, Neb.

Having mentioned these two, I want to add the names of eight others who have served or are now serving in the honored and influential office of State Superintendent or Secretary.

CHARLES STRONG SMITH, of the Class of 1853, was Home Missionary Secretary for the State of Vermont for 25 years. I find this on record, that he "filled in no ordinary way the field to which God called him and won a large place in the hearts of all who knew him."

JAMES T. FORD, Class of 1856, was the first Home Missionary Superintendent of southern California and rendered splendid

service in planting Congregationalism, and very likely to him is largely due the present strength of our churches in the state.

ORVILLE W. MERRILL, also of the Class of 1856, was Superintendent of Nebraska from 1870 till his death in 1874. The first college building in Nebraska, "Merrill Hall," was named in his honor.

Then there were two of the Class of 1868 who became superintendents. WINFIELD S. HAWKES, who served in Utah; and ETHAN CURTIS, who was Missionary Secretary for the state of New York.

FRANK E. JENKINS, of the Class of 1881, is now Superintendent of all our Home Missionary work in the southern tier of states, including Georgia. Mr. JENKINS is a Missionary Bishop, a promoter, a statesman. He believes in the South, in its present and future, and that Congregationalism, with its genius, liberty and democracy, is wanted and needed, and will be one of the elements of its great development.

ROBERT P. HERRICK of the Class of 1884, Superintendent of Minnesota, is a man of similar spirit, doing a splendid work.

W. W. SCUDDER, Superintendent of the state of Washington, is putting the same sort of energy into the work in the Northwest as Mr. JENKINS is doing in the opposite corner of the nation and getting even more striking results. They are both splendid men, doing work as overseers and bishops that is telling now and will in the years to come.

Looking over such records as are available, I find a few other facts, personal and otherwise, which are indicators of the sort of work our men have done or are doing.

FRANCIS LORD FULLER, of the Class of 1842, served ten churches in five States for 37 consecutive years.

GIDEON CARLTON CLARK, of the Class of 1847, served 33 consecutive years in nine churches, two of which he organized, and participated in 35 revivals of religion.

PLINY B. FISK, of the Class of 1885, was one of the Dakota Band.

VICTOR E. LOBA was a member of my own Class of 1879. He was handicapped by physical infirmities and less preliminary equipment for scholarship than is now deemed essential. He

did not graduate. Another classmate, H. J. Zercher, who has done faithful work all these 30 years in the West, writes me of Loba: "Notwithstanding his discouragement, he pressed on. His brave spirit would not relinquish the work which he believed God had called him to do. He sought hard places and fields that were destitute, both of religious teaching and almost of educational facilities of any kind. In such places he raised an altar and preached. He also began educational work, in a small way, of course, but a little academy with the few teachers he gathered about him meant more than words can tell, to the boys and girls who came for instruction. He must place all these on their feet in some fashion, plan for whatever finances were obtainable, bear the brunt of it all. How, with his crippled body, he could do all this, preaching, teaching, administering, is a marvel to me. He toiled, often in pain, for many years carrying his threefold load, which would have been a burden for a strong man." He fell by the way, worn out in heroic service. Higher praise of any man I never heard than I heard from Superintendent Broad in respect to this man and his work in a destitute place in the Ozark Mountains of Missouri.

GEORGE E. TAYLOR, of the Class of 1880, was another man of similar type. His whole ministerial life was spent in Nebraska, always at a hard job, toning up a discouraged church, putting up a building, or in the field getting money for Doane College and then back again serving and suffering with a poor struggling church.

I have mentioned but few names, given you the record of few great works accomplished, but those mentioned suffice to indicate the kind of heroic self-denying service these 372 men have given to the church, the country and the Kingdom.

There is a kind of distinction attached to the man who leaves home and friends and goes as a missionary to the unevangelized of a foreign country. This distinction belongs to him, and honor beyond that accorded him in the esteem of the Church. But the Home Missionary undertakes a far more prosaic task. He gives himself to serve a poor church here in our own state, may be. There is no distinction in the popular esteem, attached to his service. But no men in the Church's service anywhere have done

and are doing a more truly missionary, noble, essential work for the church, the country, the Kingdom, than these men. In the newer parts of the country they are statesmen, builders of community life with its civic, social and educational institutions as well as pastors and evangelists.

How much Hartford Theological Seminary graduates have done and are now doing, for we have a large contingent now in the Home Missionary field, the future, even eternity only can disclose.

Had I been able to give you the whole life story of all these 372 men, I would not yet have given the whole story of what Hartford Alumni have done for Home Missions. Every pastor of a contributing church has served the cause, and his service has been as essential and today is even more essential to the cause of Home Missions than the service of the men in Home Mission employ. But especial mention should be made of the work in the administration of state and national societies in which Hartford men have been and are represented.

And this paper should not conclude without reference to the fact that the term Home Missions is receiving a new definition. It is no longer limited to the specific work of the maintenance of preachers in poor churches in new and needy communities. It now includes all Kingdom-work in our homeland. Charles Stelzle is a Home Missionary of the Presbyterian Church, and his field of study and service is the Labor Union and the relation of working men to the churches. Fifty years ago the churches did one thing and called it Home Missions. Now they do scores of things in the service of the community, the country and the Kingdom, not usually as Home Missionary work or through Home Missionary societies, but these things are all secondary and really Home Missionary doings. To illustrate: A recent year-book of the Charity Organization Society of New York City, which gives a paragraph description of each of her philanthropical, educational and religious institutions, is a book of 807 pages. Here is the catalogue of a bewildering multitude of things such as are now being done locally, state and nation wide in their scope, maintained chiefly by the people of the churches, all of them secondary Home Missionary activities. In

these things the graduates of Hartford Seminary are doing their full part, as they are in the specific service of the churches East, West and South.

Putting all together, in conclusion, we may say that Hartford Seminary men have given good account of themselves in the field of Home Missions. They went out from the seminary ready to serve wherever the Lord should send them. They have served where there was opportunity and need, often in places obscure and positions humble in the world's esteem, but these in Home Missionary employ have served in the very places where their lives have contributed that which is fundamental to the nation's life and true growth, and to the progress of the Kingdom of our Lord in the world.

HARTFORD SEMINARY IN TEACHING.

BY PROFESSOR WILLISTON WALKER, D.D.

The essential product of a theological seminary is pastors. Its primary aim is, and must always be, the training of men for the responsibilities, labors and leadership implied in the active ministry. Its object is to serve the churches, not the schools; and Hartford Seminary has been true to this purpose. But a by-product, as we may call it, of all schools of theological instruction is teachers. It is not unfitting that such is the case, nor are the less immediate labors of these instructors and students disassociated from the service of the church, in which their companions who have entered the pastorate are more directly engaged. The teachers who owe their training and inspiration to Hartford Theological Seminary may, therefore, find their place on a day of grateful commemoration like this which we now celebrate.

One fact regarding the teachers trained in Hartford Theological Seminary that strikes the observer who examines any list of its graduates, is the wide geographical range of their places of service. Leaving out of view that large portion of the

alumni who, while teachers, are primarily missionaries, it will be found that the work of those who have made instruction their main object has taken them broadly over our country. To begin with those who have held, or are holding, executive positions of great responsibility as the heads of educational institutions, we note that Paul Ansel Chadbourne, of 1851, was president of the University of Wisconsin, and then of Williams College; that Alfred T. Perry, of 1885, is the head of Marietta College in Ohio; that Rush Rhees, of 1885, now directs the affairs of Rochester University, in New York; and that Ozora S. Davis, of 1894, presides over the interests of Chicago Theological Seminary. Henry Augustus Dwight, of 1844, was for years the head of a successful classical school in Norfolk, Virginia, till the destructive storm of the civil war put an end to its activities; A. Burtis Hunter, of 1879, is still principal of St. Augustine's school in Raleigh, North Carolina; and Charles S. Hartwell, of 1881, is in charge of the Boys' High School in Brooklyn, N. Y.

If we picture a graduate of Hartford engaged in making a tour of the educational institutions of the United States, and content with humbler entertainment than that of presidents and principals of Hartford training, he would still find a welcome and a Hartford greeting in many seats of learning from fellow-alumni or one-time students who have their share in the work of the class-room, if not occupants of the president's office. Should the hypothetical traveler begin with Maine, he would find Thomas L. Angell, of 1866, at Bates College in Lewiston. A journey to Massachusetts would acquaint him with David C. Rogers, once of 1902, at Harvard. Going westward in the state he would meet Addie I. Locke, of 1895, and Katherine Wheelock, of 1904, in Wellesley. Mount Holyoke College would show him Hartford represented by Lilla F. Morse, of 1902; and at Smith College he would find Henry Dike Sleeper, of 1901. Reaching the western extremity of the commonwealth, he would meet Leverett Wilson Spring, of 1866, at Williams College, and if he had time to recall the past he would remember that Isaac Newton Lincoln, of the class of 1850, taught in the same insti-

tution till his death in 1862. Connecticut would welcome him with a group of Hartford alumni on the teaching staff of his old seminary home, and at Yale he would find Frank C. Porter, once of 1886, and Williston Walker of the same class. New York city would remind him of the long services of Nathaniel Augustus Hewit, of 1843, in the Paulist Seminary, and as a leader of American Roman Catholicism, now ended by death. At Princeton University he would be welcomed in the library by its head, Ernest C. Richardson, of 1883; and at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, he would find William E. Lingelbach, once of 1899.

A long flight to the southward would take our Hartford traveler next to Atlanta, where he would meet Myron W. Adams, of 1884, at the University. At Farm School, North Carolina, he would be greeted by G. Sumner Baskervill, of 1882. Thence, coming northward to Ohio, he would encounter, besides President Perry, Thomas Dwight Biscoe at Marietta College. Oberlin would bring him a welcome from G. Walter Fiske, of 1898; while at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, he would be met by Allen D. Severance, of 1893, and would recall the memory of the long service of Lemuel Stoughton Potwin, of 1859. Illinois would find him in communication with Augustus S. Carrier, of 1884, at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, and with Alphonse DeSalvio, once of 1902, at Northwestern University in Evanston. Wisconsin would have a welcome for him at Beloit College, from James A. Blaisdell, of 1892; and Minnesota another from Fred. B. Hill, of 1903, at Carleton College. As he journeyed yet further westward, he would recall the completed services of Horace B. Woodworth, of 1861, in the University of North Dakota; and of Cushing Eells of 1837, as a founder of education in the Northwest, and especially in connection with the beginnings of what is now Whitman College in the state of Washington. His pilgrimage would end in California with an exchange of Hartford recollections with Charles S. Nash, of 1883, at the Pacific Theological Seminary in Berkeley; and with Arley B. Show, once of 1885, at Leland Stanford University in Palo Alto. Certainly he will feel that his journey has been wide and long, and he will have

a quickened sense of the distribution of Hartford's teachers in the land.

The seminary itself has properly made large claims on the services of its sons. It has fortunately never limited itself to their aid, and a majority of its instructors have been trained elsewhere; but it would be unnatural if it did not command the help of its graduates. We recall with grateful remembrance the enthusiasm with which Edwin Cone Bissell, of 1859, opened the Old Testament to the knowledge of successive classes and made attractive the study of Hebrew. None who were privileged to come under his instruction can fail to hold in thankful memory, the profound grasp of its history and the intense conviction of its God-appointed tasks with which Augustus C. Thompson, of 1838, unfolded the subject of Christian missions. His mental vigor and spiritual earnestness unimpaired, even in extreme age, when most men show all too painfully the ravages of time, combined with his incisive brevity of speech, and a wit that was as keen as it was usually severely restrained, made him an impressive figure in the class-room, which none who studied under him can, or would wish to, forget. But Hartford Seminary was never more rich than at present in the services of its graduates who are of the teacher's calling. It is as unseemly as it is unnecessary that I should attempt to characterize them in this presence where they are so well known and so highly appreciated; but it is not unfitting to record that Hartford Seminary and its affiliated School of Religious Pedagogy now number among their instructors Clark S. Beardslee, of 1879, Edward H. Knight, of 1880, Arthur L. Gillett, of 1883, Austin B. Bassett, of 1887, Curtis M. Geer, of 1890, Edward E. Nourse, of 1901, Samuel Simpson, who was a graduate student in the seminary from 1895 to 1897, and Mardiros H. Ananikian, of 1901; and they also enjoy the assistance, though in less immediate relationship, of Charles S. Lane, of 1884, John E. Merrill, of 1896, and Edward W. Capen, of 1898. Surely the Hartford graduate is not without honor as a teacher in his Alma Mater.

Hardly less impressive than the wide geographical distribution of the teachers who look back to Hartford Seminary for a part at least of their training, is the range of subjects in

which they are instructors. Naturally the Scriptures and the characteristic theological disciplines embrace the energies of the greater proportion of the fellowship. The Old Testament and the New have their interpreters. Hebrew and its cognate languages have won the attention of some. Biblical theology and Christian apologetics, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, have had their exponents, church history and the development of doctrine are eagerly pursued. Ecclesiastical administration, pastoral care, homiletics and Christian pedagogy each claim the attention of scholars of Hartford training. Such topics of theological interest by no means exhaust, however, the activities of the teachers among Hartford's sons. Psychology and Moral Philosophy, General History, Latin, Modern Languages, English Literature, the Natural Sciences, Music, and the selection and care of a great modern library are, or have been, each the fields of the expert labors of graduates of this seminary. Nor should we forget that the instruction of the crippled has been a philanthropic service to humanity, which has appealed as a Christlike mission to some of Hartford's teachers as we recall the names of John M. Francis, of 1852, now no longer of the living, and Abel S. Clark, of 1870, still with us, who have dedicated themselves to the betterment of the lot of the deaf and dumb. Though designed primarily for pastoral training, the seminary has been an aid to widely diversified educational endeavor.

This review has necessarily been hasty and superficial. It has given no opportunity to estimate the personalities of these Hartford trained teachers to weigh the value of whatever contributions to knowledge they may have made, or to gauge, however imperfectly, their influence. All that has been attempted is to give some impression of their number and wide geographical diffusion, and to claim for them a part in today's commemoration. If any profession shares with the active pastorate the satisfactions of the ministry it is that of the teacher. He is brought into relations of peculiar intimacy and helpfulness with young men and women in the formative stages of their lives. He is set to guide their aspirations as well as to increase their knowledge and discipline their powers. He has the pleasure of

seeing that most interesting of all growths, the maturing of the mind and spirit. The range in which he touches life is narrower than that of the pastor, but within its limits, it is quite as intimate and may be as largely helpful. And, like the pastor's, the teacher's best reward is the affectionate gratitude with which those who have been under his care and have gone forth to do the hard work of the world, and perhaps have won some of its prizes, look back to him as having aided them on their way. He may have a humble sense that that gratitude is little deserved, but it is none the less a possession which he prizes beyond all other satisfactions. To have helped to make some younger man, now grown strong, see truth more clearly, stand more firmly for the right, and hold with stronger step the straight path forward amid life's perplexities, is recompense enough for much drudgery and many laborious hours. Into this joy most, nay, we may trust that all of Hartford's teachers have entered, and for the share which Hartford has had in their training for the calling which they love, they hold the seminary in grateful and affectionate remembrance.

HARTFORD SEMINARY IN LITERATURE.

BY PROFESSOR ERNEST C. RICHARDSON, PH.D.

There is no doubt that the world, if it is to be saved, is to be saved by preaching, but the problem of salvation is a double one and its method is likewise double. The problem faces the individual and faces society — personal salvation and the growth and triumph of the Church. The human voice is and will perhaps always be the most effective instrument of the Spirit for personal salvation, but literature has been and must ever be the indispensable instrument for maintaining the continuous growing organism — the living body of Christ.

It has been so from the beginning. If there had been no Gospels and Epistles, the preaching of the apostles would have saved thousands of individuals and the spiritual flood would have

spread wide into the broad field of humanity for two or three generations, but would then have disappeared.

It is not in the Christian religion alone that this is true; it is true of all the great religions. No religion has become great or can become great save by having some great written standard in conformity to which all ideas are made alike. That is the way the unity of human society is brought about, whether the groups be large or small. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are, under Providence, the supreme and unapproached instrument for the unification of the human race to the present day. It is, of course, the Spirit which works and it is the great invisible word of God, binding all human hearts and minds together in one great human society, which is the great reality, but it is the outward, visible, permanent record of divine ideas in a book which is the actual and necessary instrument.

While, therefore, the test of the work of Hartford Theological Seminary is, on the one hand, the degree of power that its graduates have had for human conversion through one preaching and teaching it is, on the other hand, the literature that it has produced through its officers or graduates which measures its chief work for the permanent establishment of the reign of Christ in the world.

In considering the literary output and the literary influence of Hartford Theological Seminary three factors are to be reckoned with, the Trustees, the Alumni, and the Faculty. The material for a systematic statement of the work of the trustees is not on hand, but he who runs may read in the names of Tyler, Nettleton, Spring, E. W. Hooker, Lyman H. Atwater, J. A. Hodge, Webb, and A. C. Thompson, and in more recent times Graham Taylor, Barton, Stimpson, and Davis, a various, but on the whole consistent, conservative, convinced yet increasingly tolerant spirit, more identified with revivals and missions than with scientific theology but not without a nice little tartness and firmness in controversy and not without science either, especially of late. Is not this indeed a type of the Seminary as a whole if one grants that the scientific aspect is somewhat more emphasized in alumni and faculty work.

Passing now to the alumni and faculty the obvious fact may

be noted that while alumni publication is the fruit and the evidence of influence that has been exerted, the work of the faculty is the very epitome of the influence itself. I have been able, from various sources, to secure and to digest a list of 513 works by 172 Alumni. The list is still very rough and imperfect and it does not always mean substantial volumes, for it is composed largely of pamphlets. These works include naturally largely sermons and local history, but they contain an unusually large percentage of books by missionaries or about missions, a good sprinkling of evangelistic and devotional books of fine feeling, surprisingly little doctrine or controversy and rather little of what might be called scientific theology outside of the work of alumni who are now members of the faculty. Following is the analysis: local history, genealogy, biography, and travel, 93; sermons, addresses, and reviews, 85; natural theology and nature study, 7; Bible, 27; church history, 12; doctrine, 7; controversy, 7; ethics, 13; devotion, 26; hymn collections, 5; practical theology, 13; missions, 41; evangelism, 4; Sunday-schools, 6; and a large miscellaneous remainder which refuses to be classified.

A. C. Thompson, long our most typical alumnus and trustee and faculty member as well, has been the largest contributor to devotional literature, and close beside him should be placed the work of Father Hewitt of the Paulist fathers. In scientific theology E. C. Bissell, '59, A. S. Carrier, '84, Williston Walker, E. S. S. Johnson, and the alumni who are now in the faculty are among the chief contributors and to this same class properly belong the writings on social subjects of A. W. Dike, '66, W. D. P. Bliss, '82, and many of the local historical writings and memoirs such as Richards' "Mills." In periodical literature, Henry M. Field of the *New York Evangelist* is perhaps the most distinguished and prolific journalist that the Seminary has produced, but it has made many other contributions to journalism from Theron Brown of the *Watchman* and *Youth's Companion*, St. John of the *Witness*, Hine, Senter, and Nutting to Merrill of the *Interior*, and our fraction in Bridgman of the *Congregationalist*. Many other things deserve mention here, but time fails.

In considering the work of the faculty, it would be of rather little use to attempt even such rough bibliography and statistics

as we have of the alumni. It will be more to our point to take the faculty as it was at three points: at the beginning, after fifty years, and as now after seventy-five years, regard each man's influence on graduates as expressed by his total literary work, and compare a little with what other Congregational seminaries were and are doing.

During the first two years of its existence the faculty of the Seminary consisted of Bennett Tyler, Jonathan Cogswell, William Thompson, and *de facto* Ashael Nettleton. Cogswell published several sermons, if not volumes, on capital punishment, on Godliness, and on the work of the Holy Spirit, and even Dr. William Thompson did at least publish his historical address at the semi-centenary of the Seminary. Bennett Tyler and Nettleton were, however, the significant producers, the latter with his *Village Hymns* and *Sermons*, the former with his three or four works in controversy with Taylor and Bushnell, as many in dogmatic theology, and finally his *New England Revivals* and his *Life of Nettleton*—these last two a thousand times more widely read than all his doctrinal or controversial works.

Here we have a certain amount of controversial and theological work and a trifle of historical, but on the whole the output is overwhelmingly evangelistic in its tone, including as it does Cogswell's *Holy Spirit*, Nettleton's *Village Hymns* and *Sermons*, and Tyler's *New England Revivals* and *Memoir of Nettleton*.

Small as this production was and much of it posthumous at that, the literary activity at Yale was no greater and the posthumous percentage quite as large. Taylor, Fitch, and Gibbs, the then professors, have, as recorded in the same sources used for the Hartford professors, four volumes of sermons and essays, one of theology and six in philology and exegesis, including the lexicons of Gibbs. As the distinction of Hartford was its evangelistic writings, so that of Yale was the scholarly work of Gibbs.

Andover at this time was easily in the lead. Stuart, Woods, Skinner, and Emerson, its professors, published during their lives at least three times as many substantial volumes as both the other seminaries put together and represent an attitude toward scholarship hardly found either at Hartford or Yale, save

in the case of Gibbs. In the Andover production Unitarianism and Swedenborgianism take the place of Taylorism and Bushnellism. There is a proportionate amount of doctrinal matter and good contributions to foreign missions, but it is in the matter of homiletics and Biblical exegesis that its real distinction is shown.

During the next thirty or forty years Andover held easy leadership, with Edwards, Stowe, Thayer, Shedd, with Phelps and Park in their prime and Smyth beginning his work. During the same time, with Woolsey and Porter, Leonard Bacon and Harris, Dwight, Day and Hoppin, and especially perhaps Fisher, the tide began to turn, for quantity and quality, towards Yale.

It was somewhere about this turning point that Hartford got her new impulse to production during the three years' service of Philip Schaff and the coming, through him, of Professor Riddle. From the accession of Schaff, in 1868, the spirit of literary production and the total production of the Seminary faculty and the Alumni becomes greatly increased. Coming to the time of the half century anniversary, in 1884, the professors in the Seminary were Thompson, Riddle, Karr, Hartranft, Bissell, and the senior Pratt, the younger Pratt being instructor and Richardson assistant librarian with rank of instructor. According to the Schaff Dictionary of living divines, published shortly after this time, these professors had then published eighteen volumes, while Andover (exclusive of Park, who had passed his activity) had produced eleven; Bangor, one; Chicago, twelve; Oberlin, eleven; Pacific, five; and Yale, thirty-four. The period of Andover leadership had passed, and Yale had taken its place.

Now that another quarter century has passed it appears from the latest *Who's Who in America* that the Congregational professors of today have produced a total of 135 publications, of which Hartford has twenty-three; Andover, two; Bangor, twelve; Chicago, seventeen; Oberlin, twenty-seven; Pacific, three; and Yale, thirty-five (excluding Fisher, who has published very little in the last thirteen years). Yale has thus, it appears, maintained a good leadership during the twenty-five years. But Hartford has made great strides and in quantity is only surpassed by Yale and Oberlin, with her twenty-seven volumes and her periodical.

It is curious what a part the periodical plays in the life of an

institution. It is not too much to say that power passed from Andover with the transfer of her periodical to Oberlin, and again with the death of the *Andover Review*, and that Yale's power waned with its periodical. It is also just to say that the waxing of Hartford's unpretentious *Record* has gone hand in hand with its productive life in general.

With every wish to exercise proper modesty, I yet find the present literary activity of the Hartford Seminary both in extent and character hardly surpassed at any other time or place in America. Dr. Hartranft's "Encyclopædia" is a mere torso, and a skeleton of a torso at that, but it is original and at least worth mentioning. In Biblical literature, the one volume Dictionary of Jacobus, Nourse, and Zenos is an example of the highest scientific Biblical scholarship in a nutshell, unsurpassed, perhaps unequaled; Paton's "Syria," his "Jerusalem," and his "Commentary on Esther" have been received and acknowledged, each as a masterpiece. Macdonald's book on "Muslim Theology and Jurisprudence" is beyond dispute the authority in the subject and the Syriac Concordance which he is editing for the "research fund" is, I think, beyond question the most significant piece of scientific work which has been attempted in this field in any Congregational seminary — not to mention the little edition of an unpublished Arabic work and sundry matters of this sort by the same professor. For New Testament work, once more Jacobus' translation of Zahn, although a translation, is yet one of such proportions and such a mine of usefulness as to rank very high, while his Stone Lectures, to say nothing of his work on the International Encyclopædia and his other Biblical work, place him squarely upon the firing line of advancing Christianity at the present day. When you take into account also Beardslee's *Christ's Estimate of Himself*, *Teacher training*, and *Jesus, the king of truth*, and his Sunday-school works, Mitchell's *Character of Christ* and his other works, the production of Hartford in Biblical literature is certainly impressive.

The record in post-biblical history is seriously damaged by Walker's unwelcome defection, but when you consider Geer's "Louisiana Purchase," Mackenzie's "South Africa," his life of his father, and his book on "Christianity and the Progress of

Man," Simpson's "Zwingli," Angus' "Augustine," Ananikian's work on the Eastern Church, and especially the great *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorium* by Honorary President Hartranft and historical fellow Johnson, the record is not a bad one after all, even compared with the best of our sister seminaries. In systematic theology alone, and the controversial literature in which we were so strong at the beginning, do we seem feeble in quantity of output at the present time, and this is perhaps because so much of the work is now classified as Biblical which formerly would have been counted doctrinal. At any event, Mackenzie on Gambling, his addresses and perhaps his "Revelations of the Christ," may be put here, and whatever the quantity are unimpeachable in quality. In apologetics, too, there is a slight reminder of the old days in the fact, but not the method, of Gillett's contributions in the *Record* and his separates.

In practical theology we have Pratt's "Hymn Book," his *History of Music*, and his many other contributions to church music, reminding very pleasantly of Hartford's leadership in this line in earliest days.

Last, and by no means least, we have the work of Gillett, Pratt, and Bassett on the *Record*, and the "Memorial Volume" edited by Paton. The periodical is far too limited in its means, more limited also in its cope than the editors would like, and it is edited possibly with too great restraint and refinement, but it is a high grade, creditable organ, an immense help to the Seminary, highly esteemed outside, and, in the judgment of the present writer, not excelled as an organ in the Congregational body of today. The memorial volume, containing as it does contributions by ninety more or less of our faculty and Alumni, brings production up to date in a striking, almost dramatic suggestiveness as to the future possibilities of the Seminary, and it is an open secret that the suggested possibilities are, in the mind of President Mackenzie, intended results.

HARTFORD ALUMNI IN THE PULPIT.

BY REVEREND NICHOLAS VAN DER PYL.

In addressing you on this subject, I am reminded of the old and familiar story of the theological student who was asked to give the names of the minor prophets, and who concealed both his ignorance and his embarrassment by the ingenious and ingenuous answer that he never made invidious distinctions. I can readily see how an address like this might cause heart-burnings among the minor prophets, who always imagined themselves to be among the major prophets until they found their names missing from the list.

Among preachers, as among mountain ranges, there are greater and lesser peaks. A few only tower to majestic heights; the many are doomed to a creditable and comfortable mediocrity — not great enough to be crowned with laurel, not mean enough to be pelted with stones.

Hartford Seminary, during its life of seventy-five years, has undoubtedly trained some men who, in the pulpit and in pastoral administration, have lifted their heads above their brethren. But the few who have been thus exalted are not to be the measure of the seminary's efficiency in the training of preachers. Great preachers are born. They may be trained and cultivated, but no institution can produce them by its creative fiat. The ministry is recruited from men, and men of genius are scattered but sparsely through the centuries. It is no reflection upon any institution that most of its men fall short of genius. It would, however, be a very blasting criticism of a seminary if the remarks of a prominent writer, concerning the average college, were true of it, that it polishes pebbles and dims diamonds.

The difficulty under which I labor is apparent when I remind you that a minister has very little opportunity of forming an estimate of his brethren's ability and work from immediate knowledge or personal observation. And even if he should have the opportunity, his judgments are of so subjective a character, and he has so little of the spirit and attitude of the pew, that his estimate must be faulty and inadequate. Only a very few of the sermons preached by the graduates of this seminary have

found immortality in print. A little bunch of 20 or 25 sermons (representing less than a dozen men) have found their way into the Seminary Library. It would hardly be just or comprehensive to give an estimate of Hartford Seminary in the pulpit on such meagre data as this. The man who makes himself public does not necessarily always make himself known.

What I have to say on this subject, therefore, will cluster about three questions.

First. What type of man has Hartford Seminary sent into the ministry; and what has been the character of his message?

Second. Has this man with his message, commended himself to the churches of our order? Has he been a credit to the honorable succession of the Puritan ministry?

Third. How much has the influence of the seminary had to do in creating this type of minister and shaping his message, and fitting him to conserve the ideals of the Puritan churches?

First, the type of man, and the character of his message. Perhaps I have had as favorable an opportunity as any Hartford graduate of knowing the men and their work during the last fifteen years. I have lived in four different Conferences in the state of Massachusetts. With the exception of the first two years, my ministry has been within the larger Boston area. I have been closely associated with many Hartford men in Associational work. I have exchanged with many of them, and have heard the estimates of their own parishioners as well as mine concerning them. I have listened to their statements before ordaining and installing councils. And on various occasions I have heard them speak on methods of church work, on the problems of modern society life, and on the content of theological and philosophical thought and speculation. All this has given opportunity for observation and also for comparison with the graduates of other schools.

On the basis of this experience and observation I believe the Hartford man to be a progressive and constructive preacher. His message has been markedly definite, concrete, constructive and strong. He has been neither a bigoted Philistine reactionary nor a visionary, iconoclastic radical. He has met the new ideas with an open mind, and he has in great measure mastered the

problem of modern preaching — which is to tell the truth without scaring your grandmother. In these days when the results of modern Old Testament criticism have been so generally accepted by every minister who has not vegetated or stagnated, and the criticism of the New Testament, which strikes at what is most vital and fundamental in our historic faith, is causing a cold chill to pass along the spine of some of us, he has succeeded in conserving the best of the old and blending it with the larger truth of the new. I know of no Hartford man — and about all of them are abreast with the time-spirit and face the east — I know of no Hartford man who, in all the progress of his thought, has failed to carry his grandmother willingly with him; and that not by pampering her in her delusions, but by tact and sympathy leading her gently along to see the flowering of the old in the larger views of the new. Before installing councils one can almost always recognize the Hartford man. There is an adherence to the fundamental verities of the faith once delivered to the saints; he is not enveloped in fog; his working theology consists of his beliefs, not his doubts — though he is not without many doubts; his banner is a flag, not a weather-cock; he inspires confidence; he is made for leadership.

The Hartford man, I have reason to believe, is something more than a pure scholastic. Side by side with his development along the lines of historical and philosophic truth he has developed practical efficiency in a very marked sense. The minister who was incomprehensible on Sunday and invisible all the rest of the week, the withered scholastic, who, like the Abbé of Dusseldorf, shriveled up until there was nothing left of him but mind and plasters, is rapidly becoming a memory. The churches are calling for men who know only two strong colors, red and white, who abhor pink; men who have a positive message, and can make themselves practically efficient. Such I believe to be the Hartford type.

Second, how is the Hartford man and his constructive message regarded by the churches of our order? I cannot speak of the older graduates. My knowledge of them is confined to those, who, in my seminary days, made their annual pilgrimage to Hartford on commencement week, and then, like Melchizedek

crossing the path of Abraham, vanished as suddenly as they came. Today, even in eastern Massachusetts, it is an asset for a man to be known as a graduate of Hartford. When I went to eastern Massachusetts the Hartford man was rather rare. Hartford Seminary was little known, and those who knew it regarded it with an indifference, mingled with contempt. I remember well with what humiliation I heard a prominent clergyman of our ministerial association say at the first meeting at which I was present, that Hartford Seminary was not only behind this age, but behind all the ages. I have seen this whole attitude toward Hartford change. The Hartford man has made good. Bartlett and Davis and Sleeper and Pingree and Hardy and Rhoades and Sanderson and Byington and Wright and Hubbard and Hull and Strong and Barton, and a score or more of others, have since come to our section and have reflected credit upon Hartford Seminary. A Hartford man is no longer lonely in the ministerial Associations around Boston, as he was fifteen years ago. The day is gone when he hears men saying that in Hartford Seminary the class-room exercises are prayer meetings, where the best exhortations and the glibbest obscurantism are rated as scholarship and win the prizes. For some reasons which the average layman in the churches does not stop to analyze, the Hartford man, because of his constructiveness and his practical efficiency, appeals to his way of thinking and working.

Now, the third question: how far is the seminary responsible for these results? Hartford Seminary, so far as my knowledge of it goes, has always held truth definitely, not tentatively. Professors and ministers have differed, and the body of truth imparted to the undergraduates has not always been the same in the unfolding years. However much some of the friends of the seminary outside have believed to the contrary the theology of the seminary has not been like the unchangeable laws of Medes and Persians. But the system of truth taught here always has been concrete and constructive, and it was expounded with the power of convictions. Research has been encouraged, other phases of truth and doctrine have been fully and fairly explained, the whole counsel of God, and sometimes a little more, has been laid before the student in the last fifteen years and a high

standard of scholarship has been held up. In my day, and I am sure it has been no less true since, the student was urged to analyze, to examine, to weigh, to consider, to search, and to choose; but in the final presentation, Hartford Seminary, represented by its professors and instructors, has had the habit of saying: "These are our convictions; this is truth as we have found it; these things are pure and honest and just and of good report."

A seminary of learning with a positive, constructive spirit like this, which conceals nothing, which welcomes truth from any quarter, but which is constantly arriving though never stopping when truth calls farther, must unconsciously influence its students. It makes a man who has breathed this atmosphere, uncomfortable with a pendulosity of mind which holds everything in abeyance, and will be anchored nowhere. He cannot be content, as Matthew Arnold, wandering between —

"two worlds, one dead,
The other powerless to be born,
With nowhere yet to rest his head."

In this attitude the seminary is true to the traditions of Congregationalism, which, while it always has faced toward the sunrise, has never lost the passionate convictions of Puritanism. Thomas Wentworth Higginson has said that "the Puritan minister often lost his temper and his parish, but he never lost his independence. A hundred anecdotes of cruelty are laid against him, but not one of cowardice and compromise." It is this kind of a preacher that Hartford Seminary has worked to produce.

"The true aim of learning," wrote Milton, "is to repair the ruin of our first parents, by regaining to know God aright." Hartford Seminary, not neglecting high scholarship, nor the most critical research, has stood strong for this aim, and for a practical enforcement of it. And three years breathing of an atmosphere like this has given us the Hartford man and his message — a preacher with a message, and a message which has about it a ring of genuineness and certainty.

GRADUATING EXERCISES

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The graduating exercises of the Seminary were this year placed on Wednesday morning instead of in the evening, as is customary. Dr. Llewellyn Pratt of Norwich, senior member of the Board of Trustees, presided and conferred the degrees and certificates of graduation upon the out-going class. The Devotional Exercises were conducted by Dean Shailer Mathews of Chicago University.

In his address to the graduating class President Mackenzie spoke from Ephesians iv: 11-13, of the elements that enter into the character of the full-grown man in Christ Jesus. In the development of his thought he made use of a quotation from Rev. Alexander Smellie: "Sometimes the Church of Jesus Christ becomes cold, and the life in her veins runs low. She does not hold His truth with intensity, nor commend Him by the heavenliness of her character, nor burn with love for souls, nor impress the world with the sense of something mystical and unearthly." Taking up the successive clauses of this paragraph he spoke first of the importance of "holding the Truth with intensity." The "pursuit of truth" as sufficient for life is one of the idols of our time. It is a will-o-the-wisp, leading only to the marsh. What the soul seeks is not simply some abstraction or simply some activity, what it seeks is some concrete fact or relationship that can be grasped and clung to. Holding the truth with intensity can for us only mean real, ascertained, livable relationships. In a brilliant passage of Professor James' *Will to Believe* he asserts that anything to be strongly held as truth must, first of all, be vital. It must be alive. It is to be hoped that Hartford Seminary has not taught or led its students simply to dissect the dead dogmas of the past and to know their elements and become conversant with their relations. Only that

truth can really count that relates one vitally to living men and to a living God. Moreover, James urges that truth to be strongly held must be momentous. Some facts of science are trivial, others are of momentous significance. So with respect to the nature of man. Seek out those central truths in human nature that are momentous. Do not trifle with the little things — with the vague memories, with the transient emotions. Bind to your hearts the truths of man's nature and man's need and man's hope that are vital and are momentous. Further, Professor James says these great truths must be inevitable. The inevitable truths are those that hold man in his eternal relationships. They are the truths that get their dimensions only when measured in their relations both here and above. They are the truths that through the eternities come to meet and to greet one with the gracious benediction of their assurance. This vital, momentous, inevitable truth must exist, if it exist at all, in self-consciousness, and only in Christ is this completed truth found. In Him are found the three elements of the absolute truth. This truth cannot possibly be abstract truth. It cannot be the product of simple speculation, it must be personal. Christ in the history of the consciousness of man is like a chemical precipitate in a glass. The fluid is unclear, indefinite, because of the diffusion throughout it of the element. Into it comes, through Christ, His eternal message, and that which was diffused becomes definite, and the truth stands clear. Only in Christ shall man know truth. This knowledge may not be simply historical or speculative. It must come with the reality of Christ in the heart. One cannot know truth till he comes into intimate personal fellowship with it, and till he thus knows it with intensity.

“Commending Him by the heavenliness of her character.” This suggests the showing forth before men of a character, a bearing, which reflects Christ. The heavenliness of Christ's character was revealed, not in his abstraction from the affairs of men, but in the new way in which he dealt with them. He shared men's sorrows, their tasks, their responsibilities, but he showed them how to meet them all in a new way, with a new spirit, with a new power, with a new victoriousness. If we are to show forth the heavenliness of Christ, it must be by His way

of love, of sympathy, of practical helpfulness. Therefore, it is that we challenge you to go and live for your fellow-men. Rebuke evil, show your interest in those things that are good. Leave no good cause unhelped or unprayed for.

"Burning with the love of souls." This is the spirit of Jesus. He sympathized as none has ever done with the temporal conditions, the daily sorrows, the heart-breaking griefs, the heavy burdens of men. But His sympathy with the temporal conditions of men, and His ministry to them, did not obscure for their eyes His deep concern for their souls. For Him they seem not "rational animals," not creatures of time, not victims of disease and sorrow, not entangled in social wrongs and shame only. Not simply this. To Him they seemed of infinite value to God, and He burned with love for their souls. Man lives for God and must reckon with the eternal. The heavenly character must sweep in all the interests of man. The one central interest is the interest in the souls of men. The apostle says He loved men and gave Himself for them. The love of men is a difficult feat, beyond the simple striving of man. It is a wonderful gift of God. May we attain to a love of men that shall move us to the achievement of the joy of seeing them in fellowship with God.

"Impressing the world with something mystical and unearthly." There is an infinite danger of losing this in the modern world. The commercialism and luxury of our daily life degrade us. The Naturalism of modern thought, within and without theology, tend to destroy it. But we must recall that it is impossible to bring Christianity within the confines of a narrow, rationalized system. We must pray that this something mystical and unearthly may come back. We must learn to sit with God in the heavenly places. We must so live with God that we may have the assurance that we are bringing to men the word from heaven, bringing to men the life in God. The Church should give to the world the view of a community of people living in the light of the throne of God. If he is to impress this on the world, the minister must have the constant experience of it himself. I charge you in going forth, that you so walk with God that the world shall say that these men have the words of God in their own hearts and live as in His presence. Holding the

Truth with intensity, commending Him by the heavenliness of your characters, burning with the love of God, impressing the world with something mystical and unearthly you may go forth, and a conquering ministry and a conquering church shall be yours.

The annual address at the graduation exercises was given by President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University.

THE PRESENT TASK OF THE MINISTRY.

BY PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON, LL.D.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel that there is a touch of temerity in an outsider's coming to estimate the task of the ministry, and yet I suppose that every profession is best estimated from the outside. There is a degree of self-consciousness on the part of those who practice it which prevents their proper estimation of their own service. There is among every conscientious party of men, perhaps, also, an exaggerated sense of short-coming and of failure, and therefore those who stand outside of the profession see it more in the mass, can estimate more the net results, overlooking the little discouragements and the details which are seen so clearly by those who are inside the daily life. I had thought that the theme which has just been announced would be an appropriate theme for an occasion like this, because it is natural that a great institution, upon every anniversary of its beginning, should make some sort of estimate of what it is that it has done, not only, but of what it intends to do, what its spirit is, and what its purpose must continue to be.

I suppose that the graduating class today must feel that they are in some sense the mature fruitage of this institution and that it is particularly incumbent upon them to know what they would be about, to know what they would represent, to know what they would try to undertake and attempt in this day, this interesting generation of ours.

I do not envy the young minister who sets out upon his task in the present age, because I know of no more difficult, no more delicate, no more tremendous undertaking than his. It is an undertaking to daunt any man who depended upon his own strength to accomplish it. Unless a man goes, in this age, on this errand with the conscious support of the spirit of God, I do not see how he can have the audacity to go out at all. We live in an age when a particular thing cries out to be done which the minister must do, and there is no one else who can do it. A very interesting situation has arisen, intellectually, in our own day. There was a time, not many years ago, marked by an entirely different intellectual atmosphere. There was a time, which we can all remember, when men of science were content, were actually content, with a certain materialistic interpretation of the universe. Their antagonistic position with regard to spiritual matters was not a defiant position. It was a position of self-assurance and of self-content. They did not look into such matters, because they were convinced that it was vain to look into them, that there was nothing that would come of their examination of the secret motives, of the secret springs of action among men, of the secret source of life in the world itself. But that time has gone by. Even men of science now feel that the explanation which they give of the universe is so partial an explanation, so incomplete an explanation, that for the benefit of their own thought—quite aside from the benefit of their own souls—it is necessary that something should be added to it. They know that there is a spiritual segment in the complete circle of knowledge which they cannot supply and which must be supplied if the whole circle is not to show its imperfection and incompleteness.

In connection with the administration of universities in our day there is an exceedingly interesting situation in the field of science. It used to be possible to draw sharp lines of division between the several fields of science. But it is no longer possible to do that. The science of physics can no longer establish a scientific frontier as against the science of mathematics. The science of physics, on the other side, cannot determine with definiteness where its jurisdiction ends and the jurisdiction of

chemistry begins. Chemistry, on its further borders, cannot clearly discriminate between its field and the field of organic biology. Biology knows that it shades off into that great historical biology that lies in the field of paleontology, recorded in the buried records of what the earth's surface contains. And all of these sciences are aware that, linked as they thus are together, they must have some common principle and explanation; that we cannot stop at any frontier because there is no frontier; that the domain of knowledge, like the globe itself, is round and there is no stopping place; that what we have to do is to complete, at whatever cost, the map of knowledge, to press onward into the field where lie the unknown things both of physical knowledge and of spiritual knowledge.

In other words, we are in the presence of the absolute necessity of a spiritual coördination of the masses of knowledge which we have piled up and which we have partially explained, and the whole world waits for that vast task of intellectual mediation to be performed. Who shall mediate between our spirits and our knowledge? Who shall show our souls the tracks of life? Who shall be our guides, to tell us how we shall thread this intricate plan of the universe and connect ourselves with the purpose for which it is made?

I do not know who is to tell us if not the minister. I do not know in whom these various bits of knowledge should center and bear fruit if not in him. The world offers this leadership, this intellectual mediation, to the minister of the gospel. It is his if he be man enough to attempt it; man enough in his knowledge, man enough in the audacity and confidence of his spirit, man enough in the connections he has made with the eternal and everlasting forces which he knows to reside in the human spirit.

I believe that we have erroneously conceived the field of the Christian Church in our age. If my observation does not mislead me, the Christian Church nowadays is tempted to think of itself as chiefly a philanthropic institution, chiefly an institution which shall supply the spiritual impulse which is necessary for carrying on those great enterprises which relieve the distress, distress of body and distress of mind, which so disturbs the world and so excites our pity, among those men particularly

who have not had the advantages of fortune or of economic opportunity. And yet I believe that this is only a very small part of the business of the Church. The business of the Church is not to pity men. The business of the Church is not to rescue them from their suffering by the mere means of material relief, or even by the means of spiritual reassurance. The Church cannot afford to pity men, because it knows that men, if they would but take it, have the richest and completest inheritance that it is possible to conceive, and that, rather than being deserving of pity, they are to be challenged to assert in themselves those things which will make them independent of pity. No man who has recovered the integrity of his soul is any longer the object of pity, and it is to enable him to recover that lost integrity that the Christian Church is organized. To my thinking, the Christian Church stands at the center not only of philanthropy but at the center of education, at the center of science, at the center of philosophy, at the center of politics; in short, at the center of sentient and thinking life. And the business of the Christian Church, of the Christian minister, is to show the spiritual relations of men to the great world processes, whether they be physical or spiritual. It is nothing less than to show the plan of life and men's relation to the plan of life.

I wonder if any of you fully realize how hungry men's minds are for a complete and satisfactory explanation of life? I heard a very pathetic story told the other day about a poor woman, a simple, uneducated woman, in one of our cities, who had by some accident, got hold of one of Darwin's books—I don't know whether it was the *Origin of Species* or not—and who had found, even to her unlettered mind, a great revelation in the book, a revelation of the processes of physical life and of the plan of physical existence. She told a friend that it had taken out of her—in her expression—"all the kick there was in her." She said: "I don't find anything in the preaching that I hear. It listens good, but it is so soft. It doesn't seem to give me anything to chew on. It doesn't enable me to understand what happens to me every day any better than I understood it before. It doesn't even put bread in my mouth or in my children's mouths. But I read that book and I saw that

there was something doing. I saw that there was something going on of which I was a little part, and it has taken all the kick out of me."

I believe that her experience is typical of the modern intellectual situation. We are infinitely restless because we are not aware of the plan. Just as soon as we are aware of the plan and see that there is "something doing," something definite, something to which we are related, even if by mere inexorable necessity, we at least know that it is futile to "kick," that it is inevitable that the processes of the gods should be ground out, and that, therefore, the whole operation of life is something to which we may properly relate ourselves if we choose, but must relate ourselves in some fashion whether we will or not. How arid, how naked, how unsatisfying a thing, merely to know that it is an inexorable process to which we must submit! How necessary for our salvation that our dislocated souls should be relocated in the plan! And who shall relocate them, who shall save us by enabling us to find ourselves, if not the minister of the gospel?

Shall he stand up in his place of teaching and talk as if there were antagonism between science and religion? If he does, he is taking religion out of the modern mind, for religion cannot remain there if it is antagonistic with science. Religion is the explanation of science and of life, that lost segment of the circle of which I was speaking just now. Think of the knowledge, therefore, with which the minister must equip himself! Not at the outset, for that is impossible, but as he grows in power and in his own understanding of the plan of the world. Think what it is that he must do for men!

In the first place, it seems to me that he must interpret the plan, not only in terms which will satisfy men of science and the deeper students of theology, but also in terms and from a point of view that will aid the man in the street who can see only a little part of the plan. The minister must seek out for him such part of the plan as can be made visible to his obstructed eye, and lead him on from this little door where he enters the plan to that larger comprehension to which every door which enters the plan at all must ultimately lead. He must show men

that there is a plan and he must show that plan to them ultimately in its completeness.

In that way he must discover for men their spirits. I sometimes think that men in our age are either losing their spirits or thinking that they have lost them. It is a very confusing age for a man of conscience. In the modern organization of economic society, for example, no man is a complete whole, every man is a fraction. No man is an integer. His conscience has to reckon out for itself what part the fraction plays in the whole and what possibility of independent action there is for the fraction. The undetachable fraction lies imbedded in the mass and cannot be entirely discriminated from it, and men have allowed their consciences to run down because the mechanism in them seemed to be affected by great magnets outside, which made it impossible for them to work independently. All their little individual compasses were disturbed by great masses—chiefly of gold,—in their neighborhood, and they have asked themselves how they could disengage their consciences and become independent instrumentalities in the sight of God. The task is so tremendous and so perplexing that many men have adjourned the effort and have decided that all they can do is to drift with the general movement of the mass. They are craving to have someone rediscover their spirits for them.

Not many men in my hearing profess scruples in respect of their business and occupation; not many men indulge their consciences, and they are a little ashamed of evidences of indulging their consciences. Ask the majority of men why they go to church and, if you get the same answer that I get, you will get an answer something like this: that it is decent to go to church; that it is expected of them to go to church; moreover, that they have lived in that community, men and boys, a great many years, and their fathers and mothers went to the same churches before them; they like to maintain the moral traditions and the vague spiritual connections which go with the habit of attending church. Don't believe a word of it. It is a pure sham. Every man who is not absolutely dried up is kept alive by an inexhaustible well of sentiment. It is the fashion of our age to cover the well over with concrete so that you

cannot even see or guess the gleam of the waters, but they are there, creeping up in the soil and maintaining all that produces living fruit.

What the minister has to do is to blast away these concrete covers and say to men "Here are the only sustaining waters of life, here is the rediscovery of your spirits." In that wise they must reveal God to men, reveal God to them in their own spirits, reveal God to them in thought and in action, reestablish the spiritual kingdom among us, by proclaiming in season and out of season that there is no explanation for anything that is not first or last a spiritual explanation, and that man cannot live by bread alone, cannot live by scientific thought alone; that he is not only starving but that he knows that he is starving, and that digestion of this dry stuff that he takes into his mouth is not possible unless it be conveyed by the living water of the spirit.

I take that to be a very great and a very difficult task — a challenge to the best things that are in any man. I congratulate you, young gentlemen, that this is your high and difficult function in life. I beg you not to apologize for the Scripture to any man. I beg you not to explain it away in the presence of any audience, but to proclaim its sovereignty among men, the absolute necessity of the world to know these things if it would know itself. For it is a very significant matter, in my mind, that the gospel came into the world to save the world as well as to save individual souls. There is one sense in which I have never had very much interest in the task of saving individual souls by merely advising them to run to cover. It has never seemed to me that the isolation of the human soul, its preservation from contamination such as the Middle Ages attempted, or any modern substitute for that, was graced with any dignity at all. If men cannot lift their fellow-men in the process of saving themselves, I do not see that it is very important that they should save themselves, because they reduce Christianity by that means to the essence of selfishness, and anything that is touched with selfishness is very far removed from the spirit of Christianity. Christianity came into the world to save the world as well as to save individual men, and individual men can afford

in conscience to be saved only as part of the process by which the world itself is regenerated. Do not go about, then, with the idea that you are picking out here and there a lost thing, but go about with the consciousness that you are setting afoot a process which will lift the whole level of the world and of modern life.

Until you believe that, there is absolutely no use in your going into a pulpit, you will have to have musical entertainments in order to get an audience; and then I hope you will be distinctly aware that it is the music and not you that brought the people. But if you have something to say to these people that fills you as with a living fire, it will not be necessary to have any music or any cooking classes or any bowling alleys or any gymnastics in order to bring men to the source of the things for which they most long. If you feel this, you can preach in such seething syllables as to make them feel it; and unless you preach in that wise I advise you to go into some more honest occupation. This work in the modern world is assigned to you by invitation, and if you decline the invitation then you have shown that there was some mistake in the address on the envelope. It was not intended for you. It was intended for you only if when it meets your eye your spirit leaps to the challenge and accepts it, as those do who accept the obvious lesson of every impulse that is in them, the very dictate of their conscience.

And so, standing outside the ministry, longing to see it come to the relief of those of us who undertake the imperfect processes of education, longing to see the modern world given the privilege of witnessing a day when the human spirit shall come unto its own again, I congratulate you, I welcome you, and above all, I would challenge you to do this high thing in such wise as shall mark the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of this seminary as nothing else could mark it — by taking your part, at any rate, in giving to the world the vision of God which it was intended to exhibit.

HARTFORD SCHOOL OF RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY

Since this school moved from Springfield to take up its home across Broad Street from the Seminary, and to become affiliated with the older institution the relations of mutual helpfulness between the two have steadily increased and the value of the peculiar work it is doing in behalf of the churches has received a wider recognition. The devotional exercises of the evening were conducted by Rev. W. C. Prentiss of East Hartford, and Dr. W. G. Fennell of the Asylum Avenue Baptist Church. The degrees and diplomas were conferred by Hon. S. H. Williams, President of the Board of Trustees, and President Mackenzie spoke, briefly, words of inspiration and farewell to the graduates. The address of the evening was delivered by President King of Oberlin College.

THE MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CHALLENGE OF OUR TIMES.

BY PRESIDENT HENRY C. KING, LL.D.

The demands made upon the moral and religious forces of our day can be properly measured only in the light of a careful consideration of the new external world, and of the new inner world of thought. Both require a review of certain somewhat familiar facts.

I

THE DEMANDS OF THE NEW EXTERNAL WORLD.

When one turns, in the first place, to a study of the changed external conditions of our present civilization, certain facts stand out unavoidably: the enormous increase of wealth; the inevitable growth of the cities and the certain continued trend of population toward them; the far finer division of labor; the indefinitely closer connections of all men the world over, through improved methods of transportation, commerce, communication and the press; a resulting increasing association of the races; the call for rapidly extending application of scientific knowledge

and discoveries to human life; and swift and revolutionary changes among many nations. It is impossible to face such an array of facts as these and not see that their demands upon the moral and religious forces must be vast and far-reaching.

To take a single one of these phenomena, — the marvelously rapid and revolutionary changes which have taken place in many of the nations; let one recall, for example, the way in which Japan has forged to leadership among oriental peoples, profoundly impressing the imagination of all the dark-skinned races; the granting of constitutional government, however imperfect, in Russia; the adoption of western education in China; the simply marvelous accomplishment of a comparatively peaceful revolution in Turkey, accompanied at the same time with an almost unmatched self-restraint on the part of the revolutionary leaders; the persistence of a wide-spread spirit of self-sacrifice among the nihilistic leaders in Russia; the world-ideals of whole armies of socialistic laborers in various nations; and the rapid rise of moral standards in the business, industrial, and political life in America — let one recall what is involved in such a bare catalogue of national phenomena as these, and it is hardly possible for him to fail to recognize the fact that moral education on a world-wide scale is already going on, and that the changes already made demand a still greater moral and religious enlightenment, and a still severer moral and religious discipline.

Now these new external conditions all mean for this generation at least three things: first, that we are put in possession of inconceivably increased wealth and power over material forces — a new world indeed; and, second, that we are placed in vastly larger and more complex relations; involving, third, forced interdependence and co-operation on an unparalleled scale if society is to go on at all.

But staggering resources of wealth and power over nature plainly demand in turn and in superlative degree *self-control*, severely disciplined powers, as over against an all too prevalent lack of the sense of law in the moral and religious world. And self-control requires ideals and enterprises high enough and large enough to dominate the lower and selfish interests. This is at once an appeal for moral and religious education, for Christian

ideals and the enterprises of the Kingdom of God.

It is equally true, in the second place, that the vastly increased complexity of our relations demands far greater *simplicity of life* side by side with the recognition of its complexity.

Moreover, in the third place, the forced interdependence and the increasingly large and complex co-operation involved in these new external conditions demand in pre-eminent degree *the social virtues* — a social conscience, *both sensitive and* enlightened.

And once more, these new external conditions especially mean that the coming years must *grapple with race prejudice* as no generation has ever grappled before.

In facing the demands made by the new external conditions of the world, we may well remind ourselves at the same time of certain *elements of encouragement*.

First, under the forced co-operation men are coming to see the value of co-operation, are becoming willing to take this co-operation on, and even to enlarge it voluntarily. Moreover, second, the very greatness of the tasks, economic, industrial, political, international, set our time tends to stir enthusiasm for great possible goals, including the moral and religious. And a third encouragement is found in the fact that the sight of enormous wealth wisely directed brings the recognized possibility of great achievements for the common good, not only through the wealth of a few individuals but still more through the far greater wealth of the whole community. A fourth encouragement is the fact of the enormous educational influence of the daily press and of our great popular weeklies and magazines (with whatever limitations) which make facts, interpretations, and trends of thought promptly felt, and secure an almost immediate concentration of attention on the part of hundreds of thousands on the same problems and the same lines of thought.

II

THE DEMAND OF THE NEW INNER WORLD OF THOUGHT.

As one attempts to forecast the future of moral and religious education, and to see the challenge which present trends bring to the moral and religious forces, he must take account not

only of the demand of the new external conditions, but not less of the demand of the new inner world of the mind.

As contributing to this new world of the inner life must be especially recognized the influence of natural science and its theory of evolution, the coming in of the historical spirit, the rise of the new psychology, of the new science of sociology, and of comparative religion. Every one of these great departments of the new inner world is itself a moral achievement, and contains promise of still larger achievement to come.

Considered as a whole, they make plain, as over against the almost insane rush of our time, the pre-eminent need of thought and of time for growth into the best; they demand that the scientific spirit be consciously brought into the whole problem of the moral and religious progress of the race; they look to the application of a new standard of efficiency to moral and religious forces and institutions; they mean the bringing in of a clear recognition of a social conscience involving at least four phases: the recognition of the new standard of service, of the demand for respect for personality in all relations, the prevalence of such a spirit of brotherhood as shall either outrun or prepare for the socialistic state, according to one's conception; and the incoming of a like spirit into all international relations. The new inner world also points quite as unmistakably to the recognition of the permanence of religious ideals as a fact of human nature and human history, and shows that the motives of religion are ultimately irreplaceable. The new inner world with its great new science of comparative religion demands, thus, that man's future shall face the problem of keeping the meaning and the ideal interpretation of the world and of life side by side with scientific explanation of its processes. There will be a future religious education in the strictest sense of the term. Religion is here to stay.

CONFERENCES ON EDUCATION

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND THE LIFE OF THE
CHURCH

THE BIBLE

BY PROFESSOR T. B. KILPATRICK, D.D.

The general problem before the Conference is, How to relate the education of the theologian to the life of the Church, so that the one shall minister to the other, and the purpose of each be achieved with increasing certainty and fulness.

The special problem, which under the general heading, has, with great propriety, been placed first, is: "The Bible in the Seminary. How to teach it so that there shall be no difference of attitude toward it on the part of the expert theologian, and on that of the believing man who has not received specialized training." It is unthinkable that there should be two Bibles, the one for the expert, the other for the non-expert.

Yet, in point of fact, there does exist a tendency to this unreal and most perilous distinction. Within the Divinity School there tends to be a use of the Bible that is merely intellectual, and is unexperimental and unspiritual.

Within the Church there tends to be a use of the Bible that seeks to be spiritual, while it is unintellectual, and often narrow and illiberal. There exists, in many places, a serious strain accompanied by much pain, and consequent loss to the life usefulness both of the theologian and of the Church at large. Relief can only come by considering what the Bible is, and declares itself to be, in actual use, and what function it fulfills in relation both to life and to thought.

The following points offer themselves for consideration:

I. The Uniqueness and Continuity of the Life of the Church.

Those "varieties of religious experience" which Professor James has made the theme of his suggestive work, do exist.

Some of them are due to causes which it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to analyze, hidden as they are in individual temperament. Others come conspicuously into view when we compare men of differing centuries, and differing conditions — the men of the Old Testament times and those of the New Testament period, men of the prereformation centuries and men of the reformation age, men of the seventeenth century and men of the twentieth century. With all this variety, however, there is a continuity of life, a unity and identity of experience, which endures through the centuries and persists through all differences, a unique, recognizable, self-same thing. It is not, of course, the unity of a system. It is a definite religious experience and consists in an experimental acquaintance with God in His saving work. Its deepest consciousness is of redemption through the energy of Divine grace, delivering men from evil and conducting them into the possession of all good. From the dim origins of the people of God, to this present day, the life of the Church has been continuous, its experience has been, in its depths, the same. Its thought of God has been fundamentally one: He is the God of Grace. Its communion with Him has always been that of weak and needy men with an all-sufficient God and Saviour.

II. The Function of the Bible in relation to this experience.

1. It records and depicts it. It traces the coming of God into the world to save it, in stage after stage of gracious operation; till at last He came in the person of His Son, and in Christ reconciled the world to Himself. It traces the deepening apprehension of the Divine dealing with men, the growing consciousness of what salvation means, up to the crowning discovery of God in Christ, and the final experience of union to the living Lord.

2. It is the instrumental cause of the vitality and development of this experience. In the Bible two voices are heard: the voice of God and the voice of men; and both are living voices. God speaks in His word, which is not dead, but quick and quickening. Man makes reply in the response of faith, which appropriates, and lives by the living word of God. The Bible is wrongly conceived when it is treated as a kind of "Spiritual law-book," or text-book of Science. It is "a new home for a

new life, within which men can have intimate fellowship with God Himself—not merely knowledge about God, but actual communion with Him.* ”

No words can exaggerate the preciousness of the Bible to the Christian, or its importance to the life of the Church. The attempt to maintain Christian experience apart from the Bible, must end in departure from the essential Christian type. Christian experience is distinct, definite, unique. In the Bible, we learn what it is; and by the Bible, in a spiritual use of it, as the vehicle of the Divine word, Christian experience is maintained, educated, enriched.

III. The Task of Theology.

This may be described, in a phrase, as “the interpretation of Christian experience.” The business of the theologian is to set forth, in terms of thought, the Divine life of the Church, and to make ever more clear to those who share the experience of redemption, its source, its energy, its process, and its goal. Such a progressive interpretation is obviously necessary. If the Church is to be strong against opposing conceptions of human life and destiny, as well as against misconceptions of her own religious life, she must practice theology, must continually set before her members the life they possess, and must lead them to an ever clearer comprehension of its root and spring, its power and direction. Such a task can never be complete, but must be renewed age after age. By a fresh investigation, not less spiritual than intellectual, theology must replace afresh the contents of Christian experience, and express them in such forms as the age provides, so that no true thought of God be lost through obsolescence of phrase, or vagueness of sentiment, or narrowness of logic. Theology and experience are thus bound together by indissoluble bands.

IV. The Function of the Bible in relation to this task.

I. It provides the material for the work of theology. That work is the interpretation of Christian experience. The material upon which theology works is Christian experience; and Christian experience is recorded and depicted in the Bible, and main-

* Cf. Lindsay's *History of the Reformation*, Vol. I, Book II, Ch. VIII, § 4.

tained in vital energy by the Bible. It follows that Christian doctrine, which is the interpretation of Christian life, must be drawn from the Bible, and tested by the Bible. Any doctrine, which offers itself as a true reading of the Divine life in man, must be judged by its harmony with the scope and tenor of Biblical teaching. All doctrines, however venerable by tradition, must undergo a continual process of revision in the light of the living truth of which they are partial expressions. Theological systems grow old; their forms wither; their relation to experience ceases. But the Bible has an eternal youth. Its truths have endless vitality. Hence, theology in Martensen's phrase, must be "organically fructified and continually reinvigorated," out of the fulness of Biblical life and thought.

2. It provides the principle by which the work is to be guided. Theology must have for its determining principle that which makes the Bible a unity, and constitutes the life of the Church a continuous and catholic whole. There can be no hesitation in naming this principle; it may be described in a word as the Soteriological, or Christological. It cannot be expressed in one cut and dried formula. It is "spirit and life." It authenticates itself in all its operations. It is apprehended under conditions that are partly intellectual, but still more are spiritual and experimental. It becomes an instinct of the trained intelligence and exercised soul, a power of spiritual discernment, an ability to assimilate what is in affinity with the Divine life of the Church, and can at once express and nourish it.

Christian doctrine, accordingly, is governed by the principle thus provided in the Bible. The sway of the Soteriological principle may be expressed in two canons: (a) Nothing is to be articulated into the scheme of Christian doctrine which is not an organic outcome of this principle. The attempt to embody in doctrine, and bind upon the conscience, ideas which have no living and essential relation to the supreme Soteriological principle, is arbitrary, cruel and disastrous. The use of this canon would lead to the reconsideration, if not the removal of certain dogmas which have held a prominent place in traditional orthodoxy, *e. g.*, such as make assertions regarding "origins," or "the last things," or make use of categories that are not

Biblical. (b) Nothing is to be omitted from the interpretation of Christian experience, which does flow from this Soteriological principle, and does result from the grace of God immanent in the life of the Church. The tendency of the older theology was to overload its structure with irrelevant propositions. Yet it is not for us to be scornful of a desire to see Christ in every portion of Scripture, and to utilize all words and thoughts in which devout men had expressed their estimate of Him.

The temptation of the present day is to minimize the redemptive element which is present everywhere in the Bible. God is calling us to a larger experience, and, therefore, also to a greater and richer theology. Under the guidance of historical criticism, the theologian is apt to dismiss too hurriedly forms of Biblical thought, merely because they cannot be employed by modern thinkers. In doing so, he is in danger of "emptying out the child with the bath," and so losing the thought, because the form displeases him. It is much more likely that modern theology is *under* valuing, rather than *over* valuing the significance and worth of apostolic conceptions. The writers of the New Testament were living in a great age, the age which saw Jesus, and discovered God in Christ. They were laboring to express in the forms which came to their mind most readily, the Truth and Power which had recreated human life, and had brought men into the fellowship of God. They never meant to claim that their words were adequate to the whole wonderful reality. But they did mean that the glorious fact took up into itself, and justified, while it transcended, the utmost that was bodied forth in the words they used. It is certain that Christ is more wonderful to thought, more precious to the heart, more adorable, more divine than even Paul or John could tell us. The Christological principle will not stereotype, or make sacrosanct the phrases of Nicene orthodoxy, but it renders forever impossible the God of Deism or the Christ of Socinianism.

V. The Place of the Bible in Theological Education.

The Bible necessarily holds the supreme place, as the most effective instrument in preparing men for the ministry of the Gospel.

The study of it must always be the heart and center of all work done in the seminary.

This is recognized in every curriculum. Biblical exegesis and Biblical theology, with the study of Christian doctrine, inspired and controlled by Biblical principles, must always be the main subjects in all divinity schools.

Two methods of studying the Bible, however, are usually relegated to Bible training institutions, and yet surely ought to have a place in all institutions which aim at equipping men for service: (1) The first is that which is implied in the demand, so often heard, for a chair of the English Bible. Congregations are apt to complain that their ministers "don't know their Bibles"; and ministers themselves sometimes criticise the seminary instruction as being too much confined to portions or books of Scripture, and not giving them much needed drill in the whole Bible, and as failing to give and to require a thorough acquaintance with the scope of the Scriptures taken as a spiritual unity. Without pleading for a special chair, surely this is a reasonable requirement, not too hard to comply with in the construction of a syllabus of study. (2) The other use of the Bible is that which is taught in the institutes referred to, through the medium of such text-books as Dr. Torrey's "How to win men to Christ." If that book is not a good one—if it presupposes a wrong view of the Bible, and makes an invalid use of texts; if its psychology is bad and its suggested dealing with souls mechanical and unspiritual—then it is "up to" the seminary professors to do better work in the same line. No one will deny the importance of "personal work," or the supreme value of the Bible in dealing with the endless variety of religious experience. The investigation of typical spiritual conditions, and the study of the Bible in relation to these are surely necessary parts of theological education.

In closing, we must remember that theological education cannot be completed within the walls of the seminary. Acquaintance with the Bible is the work of a lifetime. To study the Bible is the pastor's life, the pastor's joy. The results he reaches may not satisfy everyone in his congregation.

If, however, it is evident that he is using it as the great in-

strument of his own inner life, and of his devout study of Divine truth, the sense of strain between him and his people will disappear. Formal harmony of view may not take place; but an inner harmony of spirit will arise between pastor and people, between seminary and church, as between those who share one deepening life, and serve one increasing purpose.

THE ESSENTIAL MESSAGE.

BY PRESIDENT OZORA S. DAVIS, D.D.

The purpose of a seminary course of study is not to equip men in general culture but to train them for a specific calling. The seminary designs definitely to furnish men with a clear and positive message which they will deliver with efficient power to the mind and conscience of the age.

This message must be the peculiar Christian message. It is not simply a religious affirmation; it is the very central thing in the Christian system of thought and life. It must be essential Christianity in its finest expression.

When we seek for that essential affirmation of the Christian preacher, we go back confidently to the earliest Christian preaching. What was the central message of the first period of constructive Christian preaching?

The New Testament reflects it clearly; and for our purpose today it is sufficient to take a single declaration of Paul: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake." (II Cor. 4:5.)

The marvel of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus lies not so much in the mighty deeds that He did, as in the manner in which He transformed the lives of those who came into personal relationship with Him.

The marvel of the first three centuries of the Christian history is parallel to that of the three years of the Master's life. The world was laid under the spell of a new love and felt the transformation of a new power. It was subjected to conquest. It yielded to a divine force.

The mere form of the message is not enough to account for the victory that it gained. It contained a unique element. It took different forms. That unique element was the Lordship of the Christ.

In many ways the attempt has been made to account for the conquest and the permanence of the gospel of the living Christ. Always we return to the few simple facts and to the absolutely unique elements in the history. There is no question concerning the outstanding phenomena of the apostolic preaching. They are clear as crystal and there is no obscuration of them in the literature. Christ Jesus is Lord, and Christians must be the helpers of others for the sake of their Master. This is the essential message of the Christian herald and the Christian worker today. Let us take up the items in detail.

I. Christ Jesus as Lord.

There is one unique element in Christianity differencing it from other religions. This one distinct factor is the Lordship of the Living Jesus. A man may be religious and not accept or understand this fact; but he cannot be a Christian in any true sense of the word without in some way experiencing it. The historic content of the term Christian is perfectly clear. The Christian is the man who has found the life of his soul with God in the fact of Christ and is living by faith in this present Redeemer and Lord. This is the one permanent and enduring witness of the Christian history. All other phenomena are to be understood and related as a part of the common heritage of all religion; but the Christian fact that is unique and forever permanent is the fact of Christ.

The fact is present in the constantly renewed experience of the Christian believers in all the ages. This is not something that has been taught them from generation to generation, so that at last it has become the possession of the schools and of the traditions, and therefore is kept alive. If today there were to pass out of existence all that the Church has taught in the way of doctrine concerning the personality of Christ, and if the record of His earthly life alone remained, there would spring into being, out of the experience of those who are in living

relations with Him, a body of teaching that would express the same truths in the terms of the modern age.

We must never forget this permanent condition that surrounds the fact of Christ. It is a fact of primitive Christian experience, and of continuous historic experience, and of the practical experience of living men. The value of the history of the Christian people lies in this — that it shows us the continuity and the validity of our modern gospel, from the witness of those who live and work beside us today.

The creative norm for the Christian theology and the supreme item for the preacher's message is the fact of Christ Jesus the Lord. It is more necessary that we should love and follow Him than that we should have a perfectly clear theory about Him. The experience of the soul that enjoys the saving grace of Christ is greater than all the explanations that ever have been given of the experience. Through faith in Him help comes to the human spirit out of the unseen and grace is given to the soul. One man says that he has been saved by the death of Christ and another says that he has been saved by the life of Christ, and still another utters his gratitude in another form. All are clear in their witness and the witness of all is true.

II. Work for Men in Jesus' Name.

The first element in this which we have called the essential message of the Christian preacher has been more perfectly realized than has the second. There has been pretty clear definition of the central place of the divine Lord in all the creeds and in the ritual of the Church from the earliest day. It is not until the more recent times that there has come into the consciousness of the Christian people the fuller meaning of the fact that the disciple of Christ is to live for the good of others and to do this for the sake of his Lord and Master.

We sometimes think that it is impossible to cherish at one time the two seemingly contradictory moods or tempers, a genuine humility on the one hand and a sense of the worth of our life and service to the world on the other. To the man who has any other than this essential message to give it is impossible to unite the two points of view, to fuse the two tempers. To the man who understands this text, however, there is no con-

tradition in the terms. He is the servant of his age and of his fellow men. He is saved from conceit and he is saved from despair through the motive that guides him in the work that he does in the world.

Perhaps there is no more concrete expression of this than we find in the upper room where there were two sacraments instituted on that last holy night of fellowship. The one has been put at the center of the Church's life for all these centuries. It is the sacrament of the bread and wine in which is taught the first element of the message of the modern minister, namely, the essential union of the believer and his Lord through the communion of the nature of both in mystic fellowship. The other sacrament has not yet been placed at the heart of the Church's life as it ought to be. It is the sacrament of service, in which, by the symbols of the towel and the basin, Jesus taught the essential character of the help which one life is to render to another.

Let us not now lose the full significance of that phrase in the text, "for Jesus' sake." It means something very definite, and for a very specific reason Paul used the words. There is a very subtle danger in all this endeavor to do Christian service. It is seen in the many forms of the practical doctrine of salvation by kindness and salvation by character. I do not say that it is not better to do good to others as an end in itself than to fail to do good at all; but the true sacrament of service is always rendered in the name of the Christ.

You have heard the phrase so often: "Back to Christ." It is valid for our time. But if it means that we are simply to seek to return to a historic person of the first century made real to us by the imagination; if it means that we are to place the emphasis of value upon any experience of the past; then it is a weak phrase and no watchword for the age that is pulsing with life and seeking for utter reality in every department of its being. It is not necessary to turn backward so much as it is to turn within and find Him in the ranges of our interior yearnings and convictions. The great need of the Christian church and of the ministry is the creation of the new man in Christ Jesus, without which neither birth nor breeding nor cul-

ture nor moral ideal is sufficient to break the shackles whereby the soul is bound in the sins that do so easily beset us. The warrant for all work which is done for men is the love of the living Redeemer, which is made the passion of living men who are saved into a new life in Him.

THE CURRICULUM OF A THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AS
DETERMINED BY THE SOCIAL TASK.

BY DEAN SHAILER MATHEWS, D.D.

Certain presuppositions determine any discussion of this particular phase of our topic.

1. The Church is a religious and not a sociological institution. It has social duties, but only those that fall within the range of religion, interpreting that term in a generous sense.

2. Theological seminaries exist for the purpose of training men to lead the church. Occasionally they may train specialists in some branch of scholarship, but that, strictly speaking, is more the work of the university than of the divinity school as such.

3. Seminary training follows a college education and the student may reasonably be expected to know something about the elements of political economy, biology and sociology. If he does not, the seminary must make such arrangements as are feasible.

4. The theological seminary of the better sort is anxious to perform its proper function in the educational world, and does not exist simply for the purpose of furnishing employment to certain members of its faculty.

5. The function of the Church determines the function of the theological seminary.

6. The social task of the Church and the social task of the seminary ultimately resolve themselves into the social task of religion and of Christianity in particular.

On the basis of these presuppositions I wish to discuss from

the point of view of a member of a theological faculty, not the social problem as such, but first, the task which society is setting the Church, and, second, in the light of this, the task the Church, if it is to perform its task, sets the seminary.

I. The task that social reconstruction sets the Church is essentially spiritual. It is not the duty of the church to reform society; it is its duty to furnish men and women who can reform society. There must be a division of labor. It is superficial advice that calls upon the church to undertake every good work. It has its function, to regenerate the world by regenerating, educating and inspiring individuals. If the church shall lose its spiritual enthusiasm, wherewith shall it or the world be made spiritual? The spiritual task which society is setting the Church is, however, difficult to formulate for the simple reason that our social order is in process of reconstruction. None the less some of its elements stand out clearly.

1. First of all, there is the task of utilizing and evangelizing that change of attitude towards human relations which we call democracy. If we pause to define democracy, we shall be lost in the mazes of the dictionaries. Let the word stand for that great movement which seeks so to organize society that it not only shall be increasingly self-governed, but that it shall also more completely equalize those opportunities and privileges which result from social evolution and the exploiting of natural resources.

We are already beginning to see in this new spirit something which we hardly know whether to call friend or foe. Historically the Church has been aristocratic. Any student of the history of doctrine knows that theological inertia is along the line of the extension of the political concept of the sovereignty of God. What else is meant by the doctrines of decrees, election, covenants, justification, condemnation, and atonement? The theology of democracy has yet to be written.

Over against this sovereignty, our modern world is setting concepts born of the rise of the proletariat in its demand for rights which feudalism and autocracy had monopolized. Your modern democrat thinks in terms of community. Whereas the Calvinist spoke of God's election of man, the democrat speaks of man's

election of God. The democratic spirit of the age is demanding that the Church abandon sovereignty as the controlling concept of its theology and *laissez-faire* as its social gospel, and leaven democracy with the gospel and itself with democracy. If any one thinks this is a reform easily to be accomplished let him undertake to inculcate a truly democratic spirit in a church possessed of a board of deacons elected for life!

2. There is also the task of developing a truly fraternal spirit that shall offset the spirit of class consciousness. Society is cleaving into groups and each group is increasingly sensitive to the encroachments of another. This struggle between the classes must be said frankly to have hardly more than begun. The Church is bound sooner or later to be swept into it. Indeed it is already involved. It must do something more than talk about fraternity. Society is demanding that the Church, now aware of the struggle between the social classes, help in some real way to a *modus vivendi*.

3. Another task set the Church by our changing social order is the fixing of the perspective of social values. Is wealth or human welfare to be the supreme motive in social activity? Or if neither, what? To my mind there is only one answer to the question. To preach the supremacy of the spiritual and to fill men engaged in the economic struggle with the conviction of the finality of love is indeed to preach the old gospel. But how can such a social gospel be preached without bringing the preacher and his hearers face to face with the actual problems of our modern economic world? How can the Church with its message of the supremacy of love, be indifferent to poverty that nurtures drunkenness and prostitution; to the child who labors in mines and factories; to the woman who toils in the sweatshop; to the man who is the pawn in our modern industry; to old age pensionless and jobless; to criminals and the horrors of the juvenile courts; to hasty divorce and hastier marriages; to the entire mass of misery that stains what we call progress?

4. Our social world is demanding that the Church, as the representative of the life of the spirit, care for people and not merely for people's souls. That is not to say that the Church has never been devoted to the care of sick bodies. It has so

cared, but it has waited for them to be sick. A healthy life physically, socially, and spiritually has always disconcerted the ecclesiastic. We somehow feel that God loves men a little better when they are miserable. In consequence the Church finds itself with a tremendous problem on its hands in the shape of people who have got an idea that the normal enjoyment of life is in some way hostile to religion. The average man or woman has come to regard the Church as functioning most normally at funerals, weddings, and other events of abnormal seriousness.

5. The Church faces the task of arousing the sense of social sin. The Church has taught original sin so vigorously that the world at large has come to believe that it actually believes that men are as bad as Augustine with his unmentionable arguments tried to prove. We are so busy trying to prove that we do not believe humanity to be a mass of perdition that we cannot find time to teach men what sin really is in terms of individual and society alike. This attitude of the Church cannot continue. It must rouse men's consciences. Our theology must not become palliative.

6. But we may easily overdraw the picture. The church is awakening. Today, as at no time since the Reformation, it is reaching out for its own day. Criticism has stung it into action; its own ideals have nerved it to wider outlooks. And it is a socially awakened church that summons the theological seminary, not to be less scholarly but to be more in touch with the new social spirit. Convince college men that the church stands for a dynamic message and social regeneration, and you will find them coming into the ministry. But they will prefer Civic Improvement and Charity Organizations, school teaching and the Young Men's Christian Association so long as they feel that theological seminaries are abodes of scholasticism unaware that Darwin and Karl Marx have lived.

II. Face to face with such spiritual tasks as these, the Church turns to the theological seminary and inquires what it is really doing to prepare men to evangelize the spirit of this extraordinary epoch.

We do not need to stop to argue that the leader of the church

must be educated. But we may very well stop to query whether he is to be educated for a situation that actually exists or for a situation that professors of Hebrew, Greek, history and theology think ought to exist.

Now, I would not be misunderstood. Nothing is easier than to criticise the curriculum of theological seminaries, for educational institutions can always be made the scapegoat for human nature. Let us not lose patience with these critics of our seminaries. They have much justice on their side. They simply forget that even theological seminaries cannot make plain men into cross-sections of omniscience or incarnations of the social virtues or ecclesiastical Jacks-of-all-trades. If the churches really want us to graduate a hundred St. Pauls a year, Christian fathers and mothers must see to it that St. Pauls are brought into the world; college presidents must see to it that the curricula of their institutions are as well shaped up for the training of ministers as for the training of doctors; and sociological reformers must see to it that they agree enough among themselves to let theological seminaries know just what they want done. If theological seminaries were to teach all the courses which their critics suggest, a theological student would not get out into his parish younger than Moses escaped from Egypt. And even thus he would be so weakened by the cuisine of his educational house of Pharaoh, its table-d'hôte of political economy, political science, hypnotism, basket ball, religious pedagogy, philosophy, biology, higher criticism, practical athletics, advertising, management of moving pictures, and practice of psychotherapeutics as to need another forty years of retirement to recover his balance of mind and a practical minded father-in-law to assist him in leading his chosen people out of bondage.

My own judgment is that as a rule theological seminaries of the better sort are awake to the problem which actually faces them because of the new demands made upon the Church by the social situation. Any person who would examine the catalogues of seminaries that really count now-a-days will be impressed with the truth of this statement. None-the-less, also, I hold that we have only begun the process of reorganization of our forces; that we are not yet altogether agreed as to what

the function of the Church in society, really is, and that therefore we do well to proceed cautiously. But we must certainly proceed. The task which society is setting the Church must be the point of departure for our reorganization of our curriculum.

To this end I make the following suggestions, fully aware of the fact that I may be adding simply one more prescription to an already over-advised patient:

1. In order to train men to face a social obligation, the curriculum of a theological seminary should not be strengthened by a miscellaneous addition of brief lecture courses. We have been too apt, as new conditions arise, to add little courses to an already overstocked curriculum. We have not been brave enough to seek a happy medium between prescribed and elective courses and as a result our students have neither been trained thoroughly for the conditions to which the older theological curriculum was adapted nor for the new conditions to which we must adapt the curriculum. Let us have fewer courses in the seminaries and better training for students for the ministry in the colleges.

2. Let us have a painstaking investigation as to the function of the church in various communities as a basis for educational reforms. There should be a scientific study of the conditions under which churches work in residential districts of cities, in city slums, in the suburbs, in the small town, in the country. When we know just what sort of conditions the churches must face we shall know better just what training to give its leaders. As it is, we are still proceeding on the supposition that the training demanded of ministers by the social conditions of the 17th century is to be adjusted to new conditions empirically and under protest. A study of the curricula of those seminaries which have actually faced such conditions will show that such a presupposition is itself in need of serious modification.

3. All the teaching of the theological seminary should be in some way correlated with the social problems of the ministry. The student should not only be taught to investigate, he should be taught how to take the results of investigation to his people. To that end he ought, in every class, to write sermons on social topics and problems. For after all is said and done the minister

must be a preacher. Incredible activity, statistics of calls and telephone messages, will not replace the message of the pulpit.

4. But the social task which the Church faces demands professional training of another sort. (1) First, in regard to its message. Let the student be given something which he can herald as applicable to the needs of our own day; not speculations, not criticism, not things which are *not* so, but a message which, whether it be elaborate or simple, is positive. In an age of perplexity a man does not want to be too universally assured of himself, but the preacher ought to be assured of the practicability and of the necessity of the fundamentals of the gospel in our modern society.

(2) Then, in the second place, the emphasis in theological education should be placed on ministerial efficiency, rather than on scholarship. The ministry must cease to be regarded as an academic profession. Students should preach during their seminary course. I know that such a proposal meets with objections from those who argue that students should give all their time to study. Study, of course, is necessary, but most seminaries require too many hours of class work. Theological seminaries should not be modeled on the plan of high schools. Their primary object is not to force students to learn lessons, but to train college graduates for a profession. If we are to meet the present crisis we must stop cramming and emphasize training. We must teach men to investigate fearlessly, but we must also teach them to experiment continuously. If I had my way I would have a student preach at least once a month, if not once a week, and always be in touch with some working church. This, however, always with full regard to his studies and *under proper oversight*. The Sunday-school, the mission and the church should be the theological student's laboratory and clinic.

(3) In the third place, all training should look towards preparing students to treat social problems in their moral, rather than in their social aspects. The church has no economic program. We do not want ministers spending time telling men how to run their business or what wages they deserve, but the times do demand that our pulpits shall be training church-members in social, as over against merely individual, ethics.

Every seminary ought to give courses in the religious aspects of social life and the social aspects of religion. But it should also insist that their business is with the spirit, the conscience. Once let men get the social point of view and their preaching takes on a new character. Sociology cannot replace the gospel, but a preacher who has had no training in sociology is an anachronism.

4. In order that men may be trained in this social spirit and emphasis the curriculum of a seminary should be reorganized. I venture the following suggestions:

(1) The school year should include 36 weeks of actual instruction, exclusive of vacations and examination periods.

(2) No student should be required to take more than twelve hours of class-room work a week or be permitted to take more than sixteen.

(3) In addition to these class hours, each student should be given at least one hour a week training in music and another hour in public speaking.

(4) Every faculty should include a Director of Practical Work on part of students. This director, besides having been a pastor, should have had experience in charitable and other forms of organized social work.

(5) Every student should be required to be engaged in practical religious work and should, for at least one year, be connected with some university settlement, charity organization, boy's club, or some other social organization of the same sort. But he should be taught to handle these institutions as a *minister*, not as a sociologist.

(6) Two-thirds of the curriculum should be prescribed and one-third should be elective. The prescribed courses should cover (a) the English Bible, including exegesis and biblical theology and history (1 year each, Old Testament and New Testament); (b) church history (1 year); (c) theology, taught from the point of view of modern thought, not as authoritative denominationalism (1 year); (d) professional training, including homiletics, pastoral duties, religious education (1½ years); (e) Christianity and social problems (1 year).

(6) The remaining one-third of the curriculum should be elective, but as far as practicable the student should be required (a) to concentrate his work on not more than two subjects, and (b) to meet weekly for conference with the Director of Practical Work.

(8) Hebrew and Greek should be elective.

(9) No student should be given financial aid except in return for service under the direction of the Director of Practical Work.

(10) There should be annual conferences on social questions at which social workers, representatives of organized labor, criminologists, capitalists and others should seriously discuss their problems before the student body.

5. And finally, it should be said that it is better to send men out to the churches filled with enthusiasm for the gospel as a message of individual and social salvation, acquainted with the methods of social ministries, intelligently alive to the new problems faced by the church, masters of themselves, than to send them out with an idea that theological study is concerned primarily with dogma, pentateuchal analysis and the synoptic problem. Of these things they should indeed know; but most of all do the future leaders of our churches need to know the men and the world they must try to save, the most practical methods of socializing their message, and above all, that gospel of Jesus Christ which is a power of God unto salvation to the individual first and also to society.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND SPIRITUAL LIFE.

BY REVEREND JOHN P. JONES, D.D.

I approach this subject with diffidence, for I have long lived in a far-off country, somewhat out of touch with the deepest currents of life and thought in this land. Yet, it is possible that this fact may not be as disqualifying as I first felt it to be and that it has some compensating advantages. And as I have been engaged for many years in the work of imparting to youth

a theological training, my remarks upon the subject may be regarded as a confession as they are also an aspiration.

The theological seminary is established primarily and fundamentally for the purpose of training and equipping leaders for the Christian Church. Its final object is not perfectly equipped candidates for the ministry, but a Christian Church, under men so trained, which is filled with the spirit of the Master and which seeks to realize His purposes upon earth. This education is twofold, both intellectual and spiritual. It promotes culture and consecration, scholarship and piety. These two are the soul and spirit of a theological training.

These two functions of a theological education are organically and closely related to each other. When they are separated, or when one is absent or defective, evil must result to the Christian ministry and to the Christian Church, whose prosperity depends upon the ministry. And is it not a result of this very defect which is described by Dr. Gordon, in *The Church of Today*, where he says: "As a rule, and with numerous magnificent exceptions, the incompetent in theology have been the zealots in practical helpfulness, while the masters in high theory have been indifferent to the actual state of the world's life. Unless its breadth shall be accompanied by depth and passion, the modern faith will cease to be militant." And may it not be that the loss of "depth and passion" in our modern theological thinking is not only likely to rob it of its grit and assertion but also of its winsomeness and attractiveness, and of its fertility in the realm of thought itself? Sane thought loses its power of propagation when divorced from spiritual life and experience.

It is, moreover, the function of intellectual culture and scholarship to give a broader foundation to a Godly life, and a higher platform and a wider horizon for the exercise of the spiritual vision. An ignoramus will be a very poor seer. Spiritual passion or warmth of true life cannot exist without the fuel of thought and culture of mind. Moreover, this broadening culture tends also to chasten one's piety and to bring the soul into a normal and healthy attitude toward God as the source and center of life, and toward life itself in its many forms and expressions. Sane piety depends, to a large extent, upon sane scholar-

ship. Most of the present day vagaries of religious life, such as loudly proclaim themselves to be in the interest of deep piety and a "higher life" are dangerous because unethical; and they are unethical because they are not in harmony with sound thought and with a sane and learned interpretation of God's word.

On the other hand, an emphasis upon the cultivation of the spiritual life in a theological education has a supreme value in the fact that it places a check, a wholesome restraint, upon scholastic discipline which would otherwise grow cold and cynical and become prone to overdoubt and intellectual pride. The intellectual equipment furnished in a theological education cannot possibly qualify for the great work which is before it if that equipment is divorced from and unaccompanied by a daily bringing of the student into experience of and familiarity with the spiritual significance and value and sweetness of these truths. Such an education would only produce the dry bones of the ancient prophet's vision. They must be accompanied by flesh and sinew and the very breath of life in order to become available in the service of our King.

That there is danger of yielding to a one-sided and unspiritual theological training is recognized by many, and by none more than those who direct our theological institutions. Under such a one-sided training there would inevitably develop a tendency to regard spirituality as a sign of weakness and an incapacity to think soberly and to yield one's self to sane processes of logic. And I believe that the incorporation of the theological seminary into university life, so that it becomes merely a small department of a mighty corporate existence for universal culture, tends to increase this evil. It certainly has other compensating advantages; but the secular departments of a university are, through their classical, scientific, humanistic pursuits and methods, so dominant that they are prone to look with pity, if not contempt, upon that department of theological training whose very existence and usefulness arise from its connection with the higher realm of spiritual knowledge and life. And the seminary, in its turn, is in danger of being so affected by that sentiment as to lose its self-respect and high exalted moral position, and even its grip upon spiritual processes and entities.

And, further, the multiplication of new sciences and of cognate studies which clamor for attention as a part of a theological education is exceedingly diverting. Sociology, Psychology, Pedagogy, Psychotherapy and many kindred studies are demanding increasing attention and are crowding the theological course of instruction to such an extent that something has to give way; and this something is liable to be the more spiritual exercises of the institution. These new lines of thought are exceedingly valuable and timely and must have attention. But great care needs to be exercised lest they encroach upon or invade the territory of that which is directly spiritual, and of the quiet communion of the soul with God. And instead of their becoming auxiliary to the "practice of the presence of God," we must beware lest they be used as substitutes for that practice and supplant, to a more or less extent, that which must vitalize and give higher significance to all other studies.

I suggest, therefore, that the cultivation of the spiritual life as a part of theological education should receive a new consideration and a larger emphasis, if possible, than in the past. The institution should put the stamp of legitimacy and of primacy upon the spiritual life and its culture. It should exalt it above all else in the eyes of the student as a process of discipline and as an attainment with a view to true efficiency and power in the service of our Master. It is of vital importance to men who are preparing for the ministry that they believe it to be the highest part of their preparatory culture for this noblest service upon which they are to enter, that they grow in grace. They should aim to bring their spirits into true subjection to the laws of spiritual progress and to the development of a mind all of whose logical processes and scholastic discipline pass through a heart which is in constant vital touch with God, and whose passion is to see Him and to grow daily into conformity with Him.

He who has not achieved this during his theological training has not only failed of appreciating or of understanding the deepest significance of his educational course; he has not even a rudimentary qualification for the holy, loving service before him; and his life in the ministry must inevitably become an

unsatisfying, because a barren one, ever reaching after that which is unattainable.

The spiritual life alone is competent to vitalize and to give value and right perspective to Christian truth and to all the instruction of the theological course. The test of life is the truest test of the validity and value of all that a man may have studied theologically. He who has learned daily to verify, through spiritual experience, the fundamental truths of his course of education will not be bewildered and discouraged by useless doubts and vain questionings. His thinking will abide and will ever add to its volume, power and blessing, because it is built upon the rock of Christian experience and cemented by a spiritual life which is as sure in its processes as it is eternal in its results.

Thus must the theological education of the day reveal an increasing power and vitalize all its work by its emphasis upon the spiritual life. And I maintain this not simply because of its importance in the life of the student and, later on, of the minister of the Church of God; but because it will accomplish more than aught else in the higher life of the Church itself. The obtrusive types of spiritual life which are so prevalent today and which are abnormal, unreal and injurious to the Church are such because they are largely dissociated from culture. They do much injury to the cause of Christ because they tend to dominate the Church and characterize it in much of its spiritual manifestation. These must give way to saner types which are begotten by, and fostered in, our divinity schools. These institutions must become as truly the leaders of the Church in spiritual life and power as they are in the intellectual. And the men who go forth from these schools of learning must become as distinguished leaders of the Church in spiritual fervor and experience as they are in theology and in kindred sciences and systems of thought. The dominant power of the world, and especially of the Church of God today, is the power which comes from the mystic life; and we all believe that life finds its roots in deep fellowship with God, and is watered by daily communion with His Spirit. This life must be fostered and exalted and glorified in the theological seminary of the day more than anywhere else.

And, thank God, there never has been a time when spiritual possession has counted for more or was more prized by men than at the present time.

Perhaps there are no institutions whose usefulness is more questioned and whose work and methods are more frequently criticised today than our divinity schools. And these criticisms come mainly from ministers who are their alumni, and largely, because they realize sorrowfully their own deficiencies in training and work. They claim that the present day theological education is seriously defective and not abreast of the times. It clings and gives emphasis, they say, to studies which are antiquated and have ceased to be important; and it ignores, or deals inadequately with, vital problems and issues of the day. Some are, I am told, even beginning to ask with Nathaniel, the old question: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Can any spiritual power or quickening of faith-life in the Church spring forth from our theological schools? If this charge be in the slightest degree true (as it cannot be of Hartford Seminary at present), then the time has certainly arrived for the seminaries and the churches themselves to consider carefully the situation so as to rehabilitate our theological training and to bring it into highest usefulness and power for the Church of the living God and for this lost world.

And even if this cynical charge be not true, it still remains that in all the history of the world there never was a time like this when agnosticism in faith, materialism in thought, and commercialism in life were so prevalent, and when the Church so much needed a new baptism of power and a new spiritual vision for the purpose of avoiding or of arresting the decline of its strength and glory. And how can this be achieved save as the ministers of the Church shall subordinate their doubts and questionings and hypotheses to the higher processes of prayer and of communion with God and shall seek seasons of spiritual refreshing and vision from the Spirit of God?

And I know of no better way by which this may be attained than through an enduement of spiritual power upon our divinity schools whereby our theological training may be transfused with

a new and a heavenly light and may find mightier convictions and more satisfying joy in the eternal verities of our faith, and a more tender personal intimacy with our Lord Himself.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THE FIELD OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

BY REVEREND HENRY F. COPE.

The field of religious education is as broad as the life of humanity, because the aim of religious education is not less than this: *the full life of each man as a spiritual being for the sake of the full life of all men as spiritual beings.* The acceptance of so broad a field might seem so to widen our purpose as to weaken it. Yet, for the sake of right relations, and real unity in educational endeavor, it is necessary that we should see how inescapable is this wide sweep of religious education.

The very movement for religious education owes its modern inception and its present impetus to the vision of educational ideals discerned by writers such as Herbart, Froebel, Spencer, Dewey, who conceived of education in terms of life and as embracing all life; and to leaders in the churches who taught us to think of religion in terms that lift it far above its own laboratory records. So recent and so rapid has been our transition in educational thought, that we as yet scarcely see all the implications of the acceptance of the biologic and genetic method and the life-aim in education. The present unrest and dissatisfaction in matters of education are due to the consciousness, dawning on the vision of all, that we need to recognize a nobler aim for our schools, a purpose as broad and as high as the life of the pupil, that all the material of the curricula cannot constitute the purpose of the school; all these are only its tools and instrumentalities.

Our ideals of education have become religious, if we but knew it. By education we now mean the bringing of the lives of men out into their fulness — the training and development of

the full life of the man or woman and this full life of each for the sake of the full life for all. Is not this, too, the purpose of religion? If we were to look for a phrase expressive of the present-day meaning of education, fit to emblazon on the standards of true educators, could we find anything more expressive or satisfactory than these words, spoken by the Great Educator: "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly."

Just as the meaning of the word education has broadened, so, in like manner, has the connotation of the word religion become more inclusive. Religion now has a new emphasis, socially ethical. It means not only the right life, but the life of positive righteousness, of right relations. It breathes not of dead saints but of the full, free, growing, glorious life of today. It finds expression even as modern education in those words: "I am come that they might have life more abundantly." It seeks the full life of each for the sake of the full life of all.

Here, then, is the point where education and religion, in modern terms, find their essential unity, in that they both seek, first of all, the full life and the saved, completed, ordered society.

Joining together these two — historically and essentially inseparable — religion and education — religious education means the development of lives with full recognition and use of the religious impulses, motives and ideals. Religious education would save education from barren intellectualism; from debasing materialism, by securing the recognition of man as a spiritual being, not alone for mental physical perfection, but a unified, indivisible spirit to be brought into fulness of the whole life, the life that he feels to be his when he thrills to call himself "a child of God."

Stated briefly, the specific aims of religious education, under the conception outlined, will be: to awaken in the life enlarging spiritual consciousness; to acquaint the life with its great heritage, the splendid wealth of religious ideals in the songs of poets, visions of prophets and seers; to train to habits of life as a spiritual being — physical habits in view of life's higher significances and its social obligations, social habits as members of one body, as living not to ourselves but to all, personal habits

of thought, reverence, faith, hope and the right direction of the emotional life; to train the judgment and will as to questions of conduct, moral acts and duties; in religion to train to full and efficient religious and social service. To be concrete — in Christianity. This will mean Christian character training.

And so the aim of religious education ultimately appears as just this, the bringing of all lives to their fulness in order that each may render his complete and efficient service for the lives of all. It seeks the regeneration and reconstruction of human society according to the divine plan. It seeks to make all the machinery of modern life serve spiritual ends. It would fit lives for the days that are to be, the days imminent of the keen struggle between the old competitive individualism — with its tremendous toll of injustice, misery and class hatred — and the spirit of Jesus expressed in brotherhood, spiritual socialism and service.

The education processes of our fathers produced men of high ideals and rich resources. The ideals of our fathers may not seem to have the same power over us; they ought not to have; we ought to have come into many of them as realized facts. Old impulses have waned. Our age has its new ideals and needs its new impulses. Science brings the labors of biologists and all the physicists to the service of society; education seeks social ends, and religion becomes the inspiration of social ideals. The finest thought of the past was that of the single man who walked in the whiteness of his separate life. That was individualism. You cannot reach a life that feels the pulse of today with that ideal. New days have new dreams, our schools must learn their meaning. This is religious education — leading out every life, under the power of the highest ideals of every age, and most of all of its own age, into fulness of moral living, into complete spiritual harmony with all other beings, into social efficiency. It makes every institution and occasion of life educational. It makes the churches educational agencies just as it also makes the public schools, colleges and universities, in an important sense, religious agencies. This *vital* conception of education lies at the heart of those ideals and plans which are securing unity through church and school, setting before both the same aim and enabling each to coöperate with the other.

The most encouraging sign of recent years has been the entrance into this field of so many agencies which had hitherto regarded themselves as altogether outside of it. In the case of the Church this new sense of responsibility has been seen in the teacher-training movement, in the general reorganization of our Sunday-schools, and in the rearrangement of curricula more or less according to modern educational principles, in the attempt at coördination among the various educational activities of the churches, and in the recognition of an educational aim in the ministry.

In the case of the schools and agencies of public education, the awakening has not been less significant. Of the outer evidences one may mention the striking resolution passed by the National Educational Association, the appointment of commissions on moral training in the schools, the organization, in England, of the Moral Educational League and the Congress on Moral Instruction held in London in 1907, the splendid textbook for use in the schools, issued by the league just mentioned, and by private firms here; the issuance of books of selections of scripture and hymns (as notably at Ann Arbor, Mich., by a committee of pastors appointed by the school board), the movement on the part of the Federal Council of Churches for a joint commission on this subject, composed of representatives of the council, the National Education Association and the Religious Education Association, the attention given to this subject by Teachers' Associations and similar bodies (as when the Northern Illinois Teachers' Association devoted all its sessions to this) and by the Bureau of Education in the Department of the Interior, and the steady work of the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Religious Education Association. But more important is it to catch some sense of that which cannot be expressed in cold facts, the stirring amongst the teachers themselves, the awakening to a sense of the spiritual mission of public education, the indubitable raising of the standard of the personal character and consequent influence of the teachers, the eager inquiry for better methods, the search for the right material. I make bold to say that there is nowhere a body of people with finer ideals, more generous idealism and nobler devotion

to spiritual aims than the public school teachers of North America. We need to recognize the religious service being rendered by our public school teachers.

Yet we dare not shut our eyes in complacent satisfaction with the situation in public education. There are duties the schools are not yet doing generally. Note a few of the indictments that grow out of a developing conception of our schools. They are such as, that 87 per cent. of the children enrolled in the public schools do not remain there beyond the age of fifteen, that the period of criminality is now shown to be most marked in youth and the wave highest immediately after this fifteenth year, that the difficulty of dealing with the juvenile delinquents seems to become greater every year despite the fact that public education is becoming more general and that we now have about 17 million children in elementary and secondary schools; that, for one reason or another, the public schools are so unsatisfactory to a large number of our citizens that we have many independent institutions, as parochial and private schools, and the fact that no matter how many years a boy may spend in school he must begin at the beginning to learn any business or trade to which he may be set, the tremendous price we are paying for the cramming and competitive system of elementary education in physically defective children, astigmatic and anæmic, the feminizing of our boys by the absence of men from the school-teaching force and the lack of virile, general sports for either boys or girls in the high schools, the development of the abomination of high school fraternities, the indifference of parents to the life of the school and of many teachers to everything but the wage scale and the working hour, are all summed up in the strong feeling we cannot avoid that somehow this social agency for education is failing in setting up habits of justice, truth and honor, quickening moral perceptions and cultivating the sense of social obligation and training the life for ideal social living.

Two things the people of religious agencies need to keep in mind: first, that the public schools belong in this field, ultimately they have a religious aim; and, second, that this aim is to be reached not by denunciation of them but through the steady elevation of their ideals and the strengthening of their

influence by our sympathy and coöperation. We need to be sufficiently loyal to the life-concept of education to give some of our own life to the public schools. Above all, we must take our public schools with religious seriousness, that is, treat them with the reverence and earnestness due to their life aim and be willing to pay the price of their efficiency in the same.

The university and college have entered, consciously and intentionally, the field of religious education. Born of religion, they are born for religion. The spirit of science only seemed to lead away from this aim, and now it, too, is measured and motivated by its ministry to life; it becomes the servant of religious education, to the extent that it makes life mean more. There is no matter in which university leaders are more concerned than this. Visitation of nearly every large institution, from coast to coast of North America, may authorize one to state that the leaders regard themselves, first of all, as makers of men, as leaders of those who are to be social leaders, and the business of their institutions as the development of the lives of men and women for efficient service of their fellows. Witness the many inquiries, discussions and experiments in moral and religious training, the institution of Guild houses, Bible classes, classes in practical ethics and life problems, the work of the college Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., coöperation with churches and denominations, attempts to coördinate the universities with theological seminaries, recognition of the necessity of student control, especially in the junior colleges, oversight through dormitories, proctors and preceptors, while the increase in studies in the Bible, in the Church, and in religious education in the smaller and the denominational colleges is remarkable. But vastly more significant is the fact that the colleges have, so far as their leaders are concerned, passed pretty generally from the intellectual aim or the institutional aim to the aim of religious education, that is the life aim, and are giving themselves to the business of developing the lives of their students in view of their fullest, highest possibilities.

Time fails in which to survey, even briefly, the many other agencies of education such as the home, the press, the museums, libraries, the institutions of relief, charity and improvement.

The most important general conception that any survey of the present field of religious education gives one is, I believe, this — that in the very aim which organized religious education has formally proposed, is found that which is the associating, unifying and coördinating nexus for all the many forms of modern endeavor which we group under religion, morals, philanthropy and education. Here converging lines meet.

Conceiving religion as the life of ideals of truth, goodness and service, conceiving education as the process of so developing lives that all may realize such ideals, religious education has become the process of inspiring, aiding, guiding, each to reach, in himself and for all, the fulness of the hopes of all the ages, that which prophet and poet and seer have dreamed and told us, that which our own hearts have pictured with too great reverence for our lips to utter. If that vision of the fulness of life for all, that hope of social completeness, unity, harmony, salvation, is held before us, it is easy to see how the Church, furnishing men its inspiration, has steadily held this ideal before men; how the Schools, by putting our feet on the facts of life, are contributing to this end; how Social and Reform Agencies, working throughout the complex conditions of modern life, serve also by bringing about right conditions for the growth of the full life. And through all speak ever clearer the voices declaring that man does not live by bread alone; that the life is more than the raiment; that a man must love his brother or himself be lost, fall out of his place in the universe; that a man is more than dust, and his hunger goes unsatisfied save as the food of the soul comes to him.

Does this sound very general? There is a purpose in the very generality. It is that we may take our eyes from the details and see how the kingdom comes; that we may lift up our hearts with a sense of the vastness of this movement for religious education and so the better, with a sense of the whole, each go to our own special task, and above all, that we may not lose sight of the fact that this kingdom comes not by observation, not by securing this or that or the other type of instruction, but by the might of this spirit, the spirit of the Most High, which holds before men the glowing ideals for which they live and die.

THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

BY PRESIDENT W. H. P. FAUNCE, LL.D.

The institutions of religion called churches and the institutions of education called schools cannot coexist in the modern world without some sort of relation definitely recognized and expressed. In the mediæval age there was no need of defining or discussing that relation, because both education and religion were expressed through the one institution—the Church. The School and Church were one, as Church and State were one.

But now, in that differentiation of function, that development of special organs for specific tasks, which so clearly marks modern life, there has come about not only the momentous change which we crudely call the separation of Church and State, but another change hardly yet recognized but far more momentous—the separation of religion from education. The public school, which once taught every child that in “Adam’s fall we sinned all,” now teaches nothing of Biblical history or of Christian truth, and the indispensable task of Christian education is falling between Church and State, to be undertaken by neither. The State has handed religion over to the Church, and the Church has handed over education to the State. Who, then, is henceforth responsible for religious education? The State saith, “It is not in me,” and the Church saith, “It is not in me.” Hence we have in America millions of children growing up without any religious training whatever—a situation which would have seemed inconceivable to ancient Athens or mediæval Florence, a situation such as no pagan nation ever tolerated, a situation today incomprehensible to Berlin or London, or even to Cairo or Constantinople, a situation more perilous than any other with which the Republic is now confronted. The rising generation is well versed in the history of Europe and America, but usually knows nothing of the story of Israel or of the origin of Christianity. It is familiar with Central Africa, but is ignorant of Palestine. It can recount the achievements of Huxley and Pasteur, but cannot distinguish Simon Peter from Simon Magus, and has been known to imagine that Sodom and Gomorrah were husband and wife. Thus the Christian vocabulary has become to millions a foreign tongue, the

circle of Christian ideas has become a cloudland, and religion itself seems to great sections of our population a belated survival of oriental mysticism, an alien in the modern world.

Confronted by this problem the Church may attempt to re-establish its own schools in which to propagate its own faith, or it may, on the other hand, attempt to permeate the schools already established and maintained by civil society. What shall be its aim — the recovery of former powers and implements, or the permeation of the new implements and institutions with the Christian spirit? The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is unequivocal. It seeks to recover control over all the apparatus of education, to have every teacher appointed by the Church, every school a means of religious propaganda, every pupil instructed in religious dogma and duty, and thus to return in essence to the educational method of the thirteenth century. What attitude shall our Protestant churches assume?

1. Whether the Church is to develop its own organs of education or not, it has the obvious duty of utilizing the agencies which already exist. It must steadily seek to permeate our present school system with Christian ideals, with ethical passion, with the attitudes and standards of the New Testament. The real essentials in school are the essentials in life, since the school is a part of life. In school days our children are not getting ready to live, they are actually living, and the one essential in living is character. Back of all mastery of printed symbols, vastly more important than any manual skill, is the establishment of enduring character, *i. e.*, the regular organized reaction upon sensations and ideas. The one essential in the making of men is the establishment of such inner association between reception of ideas and motor response that knowledge shall at once pass into action, and the student shall learn what is true simply in order that he may do what is right.

The translation of a Latin sentence is not primarily an intellectual task, it is a matter of will-attitude, a matter of self-mastery in the presence of the unknown, the difficult, the complicated. The examination of a flower under the microscope is not a matter of counting stamens to be followed by the chasing of Latin names through a book — it is a matter of moral and

æsthetic standards as well, of the pupil's power to wonder, to admire, to pursue the suggestions of nature until we reach the fundamental law. The study of civics, of the origin of social institutions, cannot be severed from our attitude toward humanity in general, and whatever facts we discover, the meaning of those facts will be one thing for the cynic and misanthrope, another for the man who believes that God is in his world as well as in his heaven. Hence the Church is vitally concerned with securing teachers of reverent mind and religious insight for our schools, with the maintenance of ethical standards in mental effort, with highmindedness in all who serve on boards of education, with the promotion of such an atmosphere that the spiritual nature of the pupil shall find nourishment and stimulus from day to day. Doubtless this nourishment can be afforded in some measure by direct ethical instruction. Codes of morals can be formulated, duties defined and enforced as in France and Japan. Cases of casuistry can be safely discussed with older pupils. But it would be unfortunate to have one teacher devoting his time to moral instruction and the rest neglecting it altogether. It would be unfortunate for forty minutes to be devoted to character building while all the periods before and after should neglect it.

Religion after all cannot be taught—it can simply be communicated. It comes not as a series of propositions, but as an atmosphere in which all propositions are seen in new light. It is not something added to home or school, like a new piece of furniture thrust into a room already crowded. It comes rather as the entering sunlight, showing the meaning and use of all the furniture we have long possessed. Hence an utterly secular education is a contradiction in terms. The little red schoolhouse of a former day has vanished, and the various organs through which society achieves its expression may be wholly changed. But the institutions now existing, whatever they may be, are to be permeated with Christian influence.

The State Universities are today opening a noble field of ministration to some of our more alert churches. The popular magazines are throbbing with ethical enthusiasm. The newspapers we are swift to blame when wrong, but we are slow to

encourage them when right. The public library should be a part of the working capital of every pastor. All the implements and institutions of modern society are to be led into captivity to the spirit of Christ.

2. The Church must create certain implements of its own for the work of Christian education. I have no time to dwell on this—and it is not needful that I should. The Sunday-school is peculiarly the creation of the Church, and is the institution where there is today the greatest gulf between possibility and performance. The private Christian boarding-school furnishes one of the finest opportunities of our generation. Such schools are now what the colleges were seventy-five years ago. In the small college the cure of souls is still the chief concern and the Church that founds colleges shall find through their reflex influence a vast change effected in its own temper and character.

3. Most important of all is it that the Church should conceive its entire task as an education rather than an exhortation. It must interpret its own mission in terms of process rather than in terms of crisis. This is the conception of the New Testament, although the New Testament has not always been so understood. But a religion which calls its followers "disciples," or learners, is a religion in which the teaching note is dominant. Such a religion includes the crisis indeed, as a stage in the education of the normal man; but it is vastly more than a hurried evangelism, however devoted and sincere. Primitive Christianity may have expected some sort of immediate catastrophe, but at the heart of it also lay the conviction that "this gospel should be preached in the whole world," that "the end is not yet," that only "after a long time" would the Lord of those servants come and reckon with them. Christianity taught all men to take the long view rather than the short view, and to see how through the ages one increasing purpose runs.

Here, then, is the ideal which is to govern the Church as it faces the heterogeneous problems of modern life. It must send its members, its tests, its standards, its ideals, into all the schools, associations, publications, organizations, social, civic and political, of the world around it. It must create certain Church-

schools for the definite, and even dogmatic, religious teaching of youth. It must conceive its entire task as gradual, as educational,—as part of the fulfillment of that great summons to both energy and patience: “Go ye and make learners of all the nations.”

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER.

BY REVEREND FRANKLIN McELFRESH

The educational world is restless as the sea. The curricula of the long-favored high school and time-honored college are now raked by the gattling guns of fiercest criticism. The public school has put aside the private school, and the academy; and the state college and university, with ample endowment, have cast the shadow of colossal wealth and daring enterprise over the colleges founded by the sacrifice and faith of the religious pioneers. By far the greater number of children and youth are in schools today essentially non-religious. As America swings onward in her mighty orbit, a world power, the question of national character comes home with increasing responsibility to all minds alert on moral issues; and character building without religious instruction is what few thoughtful men are willing to contemplate.

In the meantime, the swift tides of educational progress are bearing the Sunday-school into a prominence that gives it ranking value, not only as an institution of the Church, but as a foremost factor in the modern development of national life. Protestant Christianity has evolved, through this most brilliant century of its whole later era, an institution to which she now commits, without reserve, the religious education of her youth. The Church, itself, is not well aware of the magnitude of the trust.

The first fact that appraises the worth of the Sunday-school and, at the same time, outlines its method, is what has well been termed, “the rediscovery of the child.” That child life can be saved from the neglect of the ignorant parent, is the achievement

of the new social sympathy under careful organization. The Juvenile Court is a demonstration that the delinquent child is no longer an imp to be taken as the blizzard and the earthquake, but it is a little being with a human soul open to kindness and not at all beyond guidance to the better life. In education, child study tends to the dignity of a branch of science. Four hundred and eighteen books and magazines and review articles of educational value appeared in the year 1907 on this theme alone. What has the new education to say to the teacher regarding the religious guidance of the child? Where Horace Bushnell won the triumphs of a noble intellect and revealed an insight truly prophetic, it is not hard to lay proper stress upon Christian nurture and the importance of the early training of the home.

Now, nearest the home and supplying the sad want in many a home, so far as it may ever be supplied, is the spirit of the Sunday-school. It touches the life of the little child through the sweet intuitions of Christian womanhood; it offers the voluntary service of love; it cheers with song and music; it charms with colors, and guides by abundant pictures, and feeds the imagination by the story-teller's magic. The vital interest in these gracious surroundings and the warmth of this delightful atmosphere, will go far in forming the first ideals of reverence and sympathy, of trust and love.

In practical methods, the Sunday-school now uses drill and discipline, careful review, written examination, graded lessons, and adapts the teacher to the class, advances with regular promotion; develops interest and expression by hand work, uses groups and organization to secure effectiveness and coöperation. Its study of the child and the youth, its desire to follow the pathways of the new education that have proven sane and good, are bringing it to the higher efficiency, instilling a deeper spirit of reverence, and securing rich results in the winning of young lives to the Kingdom. The Sunday-school of today is a real school, and its characteristic note has been happily termed "Educational Evangelism."

The commonplace ridicule of the Sunday-school has many facts to support its easy raillery — the short hour, the voluntary service, the ignorant teacher — all these are true. Yet there is

one fact, the supreme fact, constantly overlooked — the real power of the Sunday-school lies in the spiritual passion, the eagerness, the yearning, the insight, and faith in which we dare not reckon results by hours, years, or by drill, or by discipline, but by the swift imperial power of the impassioned teacher to stir to the noblest depths and arouse the latent longings of the soul. From Socrates to Arnold, from Deborah to Mary Lyon, from the day when Moses, with shining face, read the Law at the foot of Sinai, till Jesus drew around him on Judæan hills, this power of the consecrated person to win discipleship has been the supreme force in education.

Then the Sunday-school responds to the new interest in the Bible as a book of life and for life. The child's daily conduct is before a cloud of witnesses. In the lively imagination there stand the hero actors of the Sacred page. The image of David rises to command courage; the fealty of Joseph inspires loyalty to the family; the manliness of Daniel or the courage of an Amos or Paul stands forth to inspire in the most critical hours of life; and Judas is there with lowering brows to warn of treachery. The swift bare annals of Hebrew history have a matchless dignity, because it is written of the mightiest of their monarchs, "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart," and of the most abject, "He did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord." Every page of Old Testament history is a judgment seat, and in the New Testament the presence of Jesus is felt in all true reading. His daily walk along Judæan pathsides, his warm participation in every roadside scene, brings him into companionship with life's daily matters; and the careful and lively study of his sublime figure as a real presence in life's routine, becomes the most powerfully educating influence that can touch the conscience.

And for the older child, the teacher must make the Bible characters stand forth and tell their story in today's speech. To know them is to know life itself; it is to know the deepest experiences through which human life has passed in its every-day toil and temptation viewed under the justice and love of God.

The chance for moral education which emerges just now in adult classes is something demanding the most careful study and

alert guidance. There are thousands of groups, for the larger part of young men, who have a little freer room for discussion than has ever been given before in the Church. This class forms a little self-governing group met for open discussion. "You cannot imagine how interesting it is," said a brilliant professional man. "I have a class of fifty, coming from within the Church and from without — some of them Catholics in training — and we come to the Book of Acts just as a history. We do not assume anything and I say, "Here is the story of Stephen, Peter and Paul, what do you make of it?" So we come to the full content of it with this absolute freedom. Then as a teacher — I give my personal faith and an urgent appeal to confirm their own judgment, and the result is good." It is the very thing Wycliffe prayed for: it is the Reformation liberties put to the fullest test. There can be no education that arouses and uplifts more swiftly than this school in which the young man is asked to open the New Testament and frankly inquire, "What does this mean to me? What does it mean to the people around me?"

There has been time since the first statements of historical criticism, which was indeed often destructive and very unsettling, for the careful statement of reverent scholarship to announce its results. Such volumes as the *Standard Bible Dictionary* and *Hastings' Dictionary* will lie open before the lesson writer, the teacher, and the scholar, and will mean just what Pastor Robertson predicted when he spoke to the Pilgrims, bidding them to expect a new light to break out of God's Word. Here is the challenge for the strong man, the thinker and leader, to come up and take a share in the making of men. Teachers of such groups must be men and women of brains and character and they will be put to their very utmost. But what an avocation! in a busy, struggling life, to take its spare hours, and rise to this sphere of influence.

American woman, with leisure and culture and freedom, cannot be satisfied with mere frivolity, nor spend her life beating against the bars of limiting circumstance. For her is found here the noblest sphere outside the Christian home, a task at once intellectual and spiritual, and only half developed. Let her minister at the unfolding from bud to flower of a child soul; let

her bestow the inspiration of a pure and enlightened heart through the stormy and fascinating years of adolescence; let her, by the swift authority of clear thought and spiritual insight, reveal the treasures of St. Luke and the beauties of Hebrew poetry, and she will find groups of girls drawn to her by the charm of a personal love, and developing into richer character week by week under the power of her strong womanhood.

The school is the teacher. But the personality of the teacher may be lifted to far higher powers by accepting the proven principles of pedagogy. These are, after all, only the experiences of the wisest, cleverest and most successful moulders of character from the time of Socrates to this day. Teachers are born, but the most gifted are not born with full-fledged wings. The best teachers are the most hungry always. They study the child, not as a specimen, nor even as a pupil, but as a living soul. They cast around each one the spell of a personal love, and bestow upon each one the warmth of an inspiring affection.

What provision is the Church making for the higher training? Many thousands of teachers are now formed in classes pursuing a definite course of study week by week, and many hundreds of classes are formed in the Sunday-school from the chosen minds of its young people, studying approved courses in preparation for teaching on the morrow. The courses approved by many of the denominations and announced through the International Sunday-school Association, are a First Standard Course of fifty lesson periods as the minimum, and an Advanced Standard Course of one hundred lesson periods as a minimum. These courses include an outline study of the Bible, approved books on child psychology, religious pedagogy, and a study of the organization and management of the Sunday-school. Written examinations are required and recognition of the work is publicly given by the Church and in the conventions of the Association. The requirements are sometimes criticised as being too modest in their demand, but the plan is reaching many thousands of teachers. They are devoting from one to three years of study to this important work. Testimonies are constantly received of awakened interest and the higher content of instruction, and superior skill in method arising from these courses of study, and we are only at the beginning of the work.

PUBLIC CELEBRATION

All the other exercises of the Anniversary were held in the Seminary chapel; but the world-wide relations of the institution have been so significant that it seemed fitting to hold the closing meeting in the Center Church, which has during the past been associated in many ways with the life of the Seminary.

Dr. Robert F. Horton of London in speaking from the point of view of one on the other side of the water, suggested certain aspects of the relation of the Seminary to the wider movements of religious faith in our day. The main points of his address are herewith briefly summarized.

In the complex life of the modern world, the minister must be prepared to lead and teach the people collaterally with the forces of the times to which the minister belongs. It seems to me that in America, as in our own country, there are three forces at work, to which he must adjust himself. These are the Roman church, the great propaganda of socialism and the movement called Christian Science. It seems to be that the great duty of the modern minister is not so much to disprove as to extract from each the truth which it contains.

Let us see what we can learn from the Roman church. It does not seem possible, looking from across the water, that a free and democratic people can ever accept the Catholic religion. But while I cannot for a moment argue that you are to become adherents of the Catholic religion, there are certain features which we can all accept. We owe the idea of the unity of the Church of Christ to Rome. I do not know to what extent the Seminary deals with this particular problem, but may I say very modestly that I think it is a most important thing to keep this idea before its students.

Then there is an element of mystery, divine as well as human, with which the Roman Catholics surround their worship. It was surely intended that men should enter church with bowed

heads and with reverence, and I do long in our own church to recover the mystery and reverence of the service, not by music, vestments, incense and the ceremony of the altar, but by the way in which the message is presented.

We are face to face in England with a militant socialism. What is to be our attitude as a Church, as a Seminary, to socialism? I was surprised to find that two of your professors dealt with socialism in their courses of instruction, so that it is not necessary to press the point in Hartford. Is our attitude to be one of uncompromising opposition? In Europe the socialist burns with religious fervor. It is a neglected side of the Christian religion that the socialist is impressing upon his fellows. I cannot help thinking that we should train our ministers to distinguish between the fallacies of socialism and the neglected truths of Christianity.

We in England are just receiving the first impact of the teaching of Christian Science and it is now sweeping through London. What is the attitude of the Church to be toward this? You could not expect a theological seminary, especially if it possess a chair of philosophy, to bow down to the teachings of "Science and Health." We find that the teaching of Mrs. Eddy takes precedence of the Bible. We cannot, therefore, in that form, accept Christian Science. For the first three centuries the Christian minister was also a healer, and it is a curious thing that that practice should have disappeared, side by side, with the growth of medical science. Now, does not Christian Science remind us of a forgotten part of the spiritual life? If the Church were spiritually alive, it seems to me it would have the spiritual power of healing. The reason why Christian Science has gained in circles of society where Christianity has never penetrated is because it has opened up a power that has been forgotten, the power represented by the incarnation of Jesus Christ. Why should we not appropriate these mighty gifts? Is it not feasible to reappropriate these powerful elements in the Christian religion to which we have given a place too subordinate, and by giving them due emphasis to round out to fuller power the efficiency of our Christian faith.

THE SEMINARY AND THE CITY.

BY REVEREND ROCKWELL HARMON POTTER, D.D.

If I, personally, am to speak to the Seminary for the city, I must first abstract myself from relations that have grown dear to me, for through nine years of service in the city I have grown more and more closely related by personal ties to the Seminary, both in its faculty and in its students. It has been permitted to me even to stand in an official relation to its life. At its head I find my own honored teacher of theology. How shall I then speak to the Seminary for the city?

Moreover, if as minister of this Church I am to speak to the Seminary for the city I must again detach myself from relations which have lasted through more than a generation, for from the time when the Seminary came down the east bank of the river, and, following the course of Thomas Hooker, crossed to find its home in Hartford, this Church has increasingly welcomed its men into her fellowship and its life into her own. Teachers from her faculty have been in these pews; students from her halls have worshiped in this Meeting House; her preachers have stood in this pulpit, and nothing in the life of Hartford Seminary has lacked hospitality in the First Church of Christ. Moreover, the men of this Church have been associated in the control of the Seminary, they have reached forth with generous hands of help for its need. The Church has been glad of this alliance which has provoked her unto good works. Her prayers have been offered for divine guidance and blessing upon the work of the Seminary both here and in the wide field, which is the world. How then shall I, as minister of this Church, speak to the Seminary for the city?

Yet I recognize that it is fitting that words of congratulation and of Godspeed should be spoken from the city to the Seminary in this anniversary festival. The city forty years ago welcomed the Seminary to her homes. Increasingly from the beginning have the men of the Seminary found hospitality in the homes of Hartford. If witness were needed to this, the daughters of our city who have gone forth into all parts of our country and of the world, led by Seminary men, could testify eloquently how

near and dear this relation has often become. For your coming to us we have been grateful. It has meant much to the city that during forty years, from the Far West, out of the great central states and from all parts of New England, from the colleges of our land men have come among us to enter our homes and to mingle with us in the common life. It has meant more to us that they have gone forth freighted with our love and followed with our prayers throughout our country and the world to bear the message they received here and to give their service in the kingdom. The life of the Seminary has helped to emancipate Hartford from the provincialism of a little town and to give us citizenship in the world.

We have welcomed you into our thought. A Theological Seminary that is alive, is keenly sensitive to the currents of thought in the world. If true to its mission it must feel the force of these, weigh their value and react upon them with its own positive message and vigorous life. This has been true in Hartford Seminary and it has meant much for the intellectual life of Hartford. Your teachers have with a wide outlook surveyed the field of thought; they have been willing and ready to report to us that which they have seen; they have widened the horizons of our thinking. Moreover, from all the centers of scholarship you have drawn men of light and leading to declare their message among us. We have learned to await their coming with glad, hospitable, and eager minds. They have stimulated our thinking. They have exalted noble ideals before us. We live a richer, fuller life because of their ministries. You have helped to emancipate Hartford from the intellectual provincialism of a little town. The city is a nobler place in which to live and work because here for forty years the Seminary has lifted her watch-tower with its outlook upon the world of thought.

Because of these personal and intellectual relationships the heart of the city has given hospitality to the Seminary. You are part of her common life. Her prayers and hopes are with you and over you. It has meant much that men and women who have spoken in all these Churches of the vicinity are now scattered all over the world in the service of Christ. It has meant much that men who have bowed for ordination in this Meeting

House and yonder on the hill, are achieving their work of ministry and their witness of love in pagan lands today. It has meant much that in the personnel of your faculty you have ever urged the highest ideals of civic life upon us. We thank you for this ministry. It has been a ministry of the Christ. We ask you to continue its gracious work among us. Spare us not. Declare to us faithfully the whole counsel of God. Lift up among us the Christ as a Church lifts Him up in its parish. Our prayers are with you and for you. Our loyalty will gladly follow you. We shall be confident in your leadership, for we trust you that you follow Jesus.

THE SEMINARY AND THE NATION.

BY REVEREND HUBERT HERRING, D.D.

The nation needs leadership. Needs it as a whole and in detail. Can the seminary furnish it? If so, in what degree and in what relative importance to other sources of leadership?

Let me emphasize the nation's need. We belong to a race on the whole speechless. Vaguely men fashion their thought. They have little power to tell it. The leader appears and gives a voice to the mass. Men find no way to do the thing for which hearts beat and muscles ache. The leader comes and energy is loosed to bring results. All history of speech and deed thus centers in the leader.

But alas, in the finer sort he has been all too rare. Now and again God's man appears and God's kingdom comes. He passes on and progress stays. We have a fashion of saying when a great man dies, "God will raise up someone to take his place. No man is indispensable." The words have a pious sound *et præterea nihil*. They belong to that cheap order of optimism which plunges the beholder into pessimism. I do not know who took Mazzini's place, nor Luther's, nor Browning's, nor Gladstone's, nor Lincoln's. Oh yes, I do remember that last. It was Andrew Johnson. No! No! The world starves for leadership. Had it been more abundant in quantity and finer in quality our

old world had long since become a new world. One figure towers above the dreary annals of the Celestial Empire. Conceive what the China of today would be if following Confucius there had arisen another leader of his kind and that the succession had had no break until some sage and saint more lofty than they all had led the nation into the glory of the Light of the World.

If with consenting mind you have heard me say how great is the dependence of humanity upon its leaders you will not be far from the acceptance of my thesis that the institution which trains men for the ministry has a place of primacy in the nation's service.

It would be carrying corn to Egypt if I should in this prelude to dwell at length upon the considerations which in theory emphasize the civic responsibility of the seminary. If it be still true that the minister is a prophet charged to speak on God's behalf; if it is his business to master the hidden things of God's mind and the demands of His law that he may proclaim them in the ears of men, then by definition the seminary is commissioned to furnish consummate leadership to the state. If it be still true that the minister is a priest charged so to learn the way to the throne of God's grace that he may lead others there and on behalf of their faltering faith make intercession with divine love, then by definition the seminary is commissioned to furnish consummate leadership to the state. For the state stands or falls in the measure of its relationship to God, who ordained its existence. And that relationship is established only through those citizens to whom prophet and priest may minister.

It is equally superfluous to demonstrate from history how great is the service the seminary can render the nation. Men trained in sacred love have always been potent in the state for good and ill. In the evil days of the Church they made and unmade kings, shaped legislation, gathered vast wealth. In fairer days in your own New England the minister was not only potent as shepherd and teacher of his flock, but the conspicuous civic figure of his community and of his state. I am speaking in the city where Bushnell and Walker and Burton, Hawes and Lamson and more of their kind have lived.

But laying aside theory and dismissing history in what measure is it actually possible for the seminary to mold the nation of today? Fine words butter no parsnips. It is mockery to assume for our seminaries the power to accomplish what the conditions of our age and land may forbid. Are we in any measure guilty of such mockery in the assumptions upon which we are proceeding? Let us see. We shall agree at once that the task of the seminary of today is an exacting one. It must fit men for meeting unparalleled demands in their relation to the larger life of our land. For our nation is in the making. Pass in thought to one of the great rising commonwealths of the west. Let it be the state of Washington on our far northwest corner. In area an empire. In resources varied and boundless, whether of the soil or the mine or the forest or the river or the sea. In and out from its gateways flows already the tide of commerce between Occident and Orient. In coming decades that tide will swell to unimaginable volume. Great cities are rising and are still to rise. The paganism of Asia will join hands with the commercialism of America to make of them if it may be the devil's throne. Washington may become a menace to the nation's health and peace and safety. Do you doubt it? Remember San Francisco. Or Washington may become a bulwark of national power, a mighty storehouse of abiding values in character and achievement. The quality of leadership must determine which.

Does it lie within the power of the seminary of today to fashion men into fitness for grappling with such gigantic tasks? Can you send from your quiet halls leaders whose unblurred faith, whose square-jawed courage, whose Pauline passion, whose worldly, heavenly wisdom shall enable them to mould such a fast developing civilization for God? If you can — well. If not, I know not where to look.

The social ferment is upon us. Men's hearts are hot. Men's tongues are quick with late born inquiries and with unripe affirmations. Like a giant cauldron the fluid life of the age seethes and moves. "Problem" is the word symbolic of the time. We are sure that social obligations new and imperative are upon us. But where and how shall one apply himself to them. We waver between the fascination of the untried new and the security

of the tested old. We alternate between hatred of the evils we have and fear of those which change may bring. Some of us have in quiet hours these last two years framed for ourselves a mental picture of the home of the man who is out of work. As the grim lines of the picture have been fitted in — the idle days, the fruitless search, the shrinking store, the wife's drawn face, the children's hunger, the tenement's chill, the pauper's dole — we have entered into the workman's dumb revolt and bitter hate for an order of things in which one is deprived of the last, least, final human right — the right to live on the earth into which, without will of his own, he was born. And then we have wondered what graver ill might come to a society in which the responsibility were shifted from the individual to the whole and whether then we might not lose the hard won possessions of the present order and gain no others to take their place. So between fever and chill we vibrate. Meanwhile, industrial strife goes on, commerce claims its tale of victims, the family bond is weakened, the lust for pleasure grows, the weekly day of rest is passing, luxury abounds, and want hard by.

Can you in your quiet halls fashion leaders whose human sympathy shall be so wide, whose patience shall be so unconquerable, whose Christlikeness shall be so evident that they can mediate between those who strive and lead men up to new levels of brotherly love and purer aspirations? If you can — well. If you can not, I know not where to look.

Our nation seems appointed to be a solvent of races. Through all our gateways, from every zone, they press upon us. Last year the stream slackened. This year it flows bank full again. Caucasian and Negro, Jew and Gentile, European and Asiatic, they jostle us on the streets. They swell our congested cities. They constitute the major half of the city problem. They embarrass us politically, educationally, religiously, æsthetically, ethically. They outpopulate us. They push us from our seats. It is a strange experience. That these incoming peoples will become what we complacently call Americanized there is no doubt. But what type of American will they make? How will it all issue? It is impossible to question that we whose longer residence gives us some little right to the name American must

largely determine the issue. We must maintain a moral and spiritual vitality, we must show a fraternal aggressiveness, we must exercise a vicarious wisdom which shall enable us to retain the highest qualities of historic America while assimilating such new values as the immigrant may bring. It is a stupendous task. Obstacles innumerable oppose its achievement. Race prejudice and race pride stand across the pathway. Religious cleavages divide us. Historic tendencies diverge. Temperamental differences are everywhere. The greed which exploits ignorance and the political ambition which uses it as a stepping stone will undo much that we can do. Shall we ever have a nation united in heart and ideals — one beneath the cross as it is one beneath the flag? I can think of no cause to which martyr devotion might more fitly be given.

Can you send from your quiet halls men who shall give masterly leadership for the accomplishment of this unique and perilous undertaking in nation building? If you can — well. If not, to whom shall we look?

May I tell you how anxiously those to whom is intrusted the guidance of home mission effort are asking the questions which I have just framed? They are ever with us. Our unceasing, our well nigh despairing cry is for men. On the one hand is the continually accumulating evidence that with the right and fit men we can shape new communities, redeem city slums, establish civic righteousness, obliterate bareness of speech and race, transform the nation into the Kingdom of God. On the other is the oppressive consciousness that those men are rare. For the most part we must assign to these pioneer tasks, these exigent posts, men whose accomplishment is infallibly certain to fall short of the demand. In saying this I am not passing criticism upon my brethren of the ministry. I am simply saying that the high leadership which these exacting times demand is beyond the reach of ordinary powers. The minister of today needs to be in a higher sense than Nietzsche was capable of comprehending "the superhuman." Not in mental ability. Acquit me of the folly of asserting that. The men I know who are wielding mightiest influence have not brilliant minds. Brilliancy is a perilous gift for the minister. But they are men who have

spiritual momentum, men in whom dwell faith and the power of the Holy Ghost. Strong personalities? you say. Yes, if by that you mean something broad enough to include the man whom the world calls weak and who is weak save in the ability to discern the highest meaning of life and to make himself a medium through which the strength of God can reach and mold human hearts. For the production of such men the seminary has by no means an exclusive responsibility. The profuse and sometimes witless criticism of our seminaries which has appeared in recent years, has among its fatuities often assumed that the seminary can make good every delinquency of the home and the college and the church. Such miracles are not wrought by men nor demanded of them.

But the seminary's obligation is serious enough. A world sin-blighted and sorrow-burdened calls for helpers. A social order laden with ancient injustices, poisoned with modern evils calls for deliverers. Our nation and the nations call for heaven-touched leadership. Who shall hear and answer and meet the need, if it be not those schools in whose class rooms men ponder day by day upon the truths which shall abide, the duties which shall not change, the high sanctions of life by which heaven and earth, time and eternity, are bound in one?

It is no part of my duty to attempt to say how the seminary may best equip itself to meet these heavy obligations. But I am sure I shall give voice to your conviction when I say that it will not be mainly by reshaping of curricula or modifying the teaching to answer the demand of the time. It must be done as it always has been done, by the power of the redeemed personalities who make up the faculty.

My mind flashes back across the years to my own seminary days. I remember little of what I was taught. But I remember how one man stirred my sleeping soul to life by his personal loyalty to his Lord; how another made me feel the significance of scholarship by his dogged devotion to the simple and unadorned fact, and how another lifted me out of myself and bore me away on the tide of his evangelical longing for the redemption of the world.

In such is the power and significance of any seminary. If in

each of them there were a man with some dash of the ethereal idealism of St. Francis, another with the rough and ready realism of Moody, another with the tranquil mysticism of Faber, another with the unworldly enterprise of Livingstone, another with the healthy rationalism of Brooks, another with Lord Shaftesbury's passion for humanity, and another with Jonathan Edwards' passion for God, every student would go forth from its halls equipped for the highest service within the range of his powers. The beloved and honored teachers who train our ministry are under solemn responsibility to be such men as that ministry needs to be if it shall meet the demand of our age.

THE SEMINARY AND THE WORLD.

BY HON. SAMUEL B. CAPEN, LL.D.

The world as it is today, and not the world of yesterday, is what we men are especially interested in now. Yet it may be helpful to our discussion to look briefly at the past, that it may give us a better understanding of the present.

First. What was the world of yesterday? A little over a hundred years ago modern missions were born. The earlier missionaries from this country sailed out into the unknown. In India they were refused permission to land, the East India Company declaring that they had rather have a ship-load of devils than a ship-load of missionaries. China was closed to the world. Forty years ago you could see signs posted all over Japan, to the effect that if any Christian preacher, or Christian teacher, or even the Christian's God himself should dare touch foot on Japanese soil he would be beheaded. The islands of the sea were filled with cannibalism and almost every form of barbarity. It was a dark hour in the history of the world. Bishop Thoburn has expressed it thus: "Three of five great continents and two-thirds of the fourth were sealed against God's messengers and God's truth."

Second. What is the world of today? Not only is it an "open door" everywhere for commerce, but it is especially an

open door for the missionary. Steam and the cable have practically annihilated time and space. We have belted the world with our churches and schools and hospitals and printing and industrial plants. Let the change which has come over Turkey be an illustration of what has taken place in every part of the world. July 24th, 1908, is to the Turkish nation what July 4, 1776, is to our own country. Until July 24th a Moslem was not bound to recognize that the Christian had any rights that he should respect. Now the High Priest of Mohammedanism for Turkey and the whole world has declared publicly in the name of the Sultan that Moslem and Christian are equal in the sight of God and before the law. There is everywhere proclaimed religious liberty. The recent dreadful massacres have not changed this condition; they are only the birth throes that must be expected with the opening of the new day in Turkey. Constitutional government will be more strongly entrenched than before. Rev. Dr. Justin E. Abbott, one of the missionaries of the American Board, has declared that India is becoming unconsciously Christian. The great Napoleon said, "God pity us when China awakes; let her sleep, let her sleep." But China has awakened, and scarcely ever before in the world's history has a nation changed so rapidly as the Chinese Empire since the Boxer outrage. The victory of Japan over Russia has aroused all Asia, from Constantinople to Korea. The East and the West are touching each other commercially, politically, and socially as never before. There is a race and national consciousness and a desire for religious liberty, a growing dissatisfaction with things as they are and a desire for something better. All Asia is in a state of flux and is more than ever ready for the Christian preacher and teacher.

Third. The increased opportunity of the American missionary in the world of today. At this juncture, when we have come to the "renaissance of the Orient" and its universal awakening, the United States has become a world power as never before. The battle of Manila Bay and the destruction of Cervera's fleet changed entirely our position as a nation. It was the influence of this nation that saved the first Hague Conference from breaking up without result. It was this nation that saved it from

being brought into contempt after the plan had been matured. It was the influence of our nation that called the second Hague Conference. It was President Roosevelt that brought about peace between Japan and Russia. The Golden Rule policy of Mr. Hay, followed up by that of Mr. Root, especially as shown in his dealings with the South American republics, has given new prestige to the American missionary everywhere. There is always an obligation following an opportunity. Professor Edward C. Moore has well said, "Not only is this the greatest opportunity the Church has ever had, but it is the greatest opportunity the Church ever can have."

Fourth. What is the bearing of all this upon the graduates of the seminary? We need today as foreign missionaries the largest men spiritually and intellectually that the seminaries can graduate. With this wide open world and with the new power given to the American missionary, it must also be remembered that we are not trying to save a few individuals here and there, but we are at work to remold and change empires. The foreign missionary ought to be a great leader—a general among men, having to do with the training of native preachers and teachers. We have come to the time when men are more and more recognizing the importance of the *trained mind*. Some business firms will no longer employ any man who is not a college graduate. I repeat there is no place where the trained mind is so important as in the foreign field, where a missionary is more or less alone and thrown largely on his own resources. What can a "short-cut man" do with the trained men of India, or China, or Japan?

The missionary needs to be *fully equipped* before he starts; he should know the field, the history of his time, the forces at work and the non-Christian religions which he is to oppose. As a part of his equipment he should understand some of the great economic questions, since many parts of Asia and Africa are becoming more and more controlled by European nations. A little time ago a distinguished Berlin economist said, "The necessity of every country to buy and sell more and more largely in foreign markets is forcing every nation into an international industrial struggle. This is the key-note of the new century." What will be the effect of all this effort for larger markets

upon our missionary work? Commerce is going everywhere and commerce without Christianity is a curse.

The influences which have already come from the Christian world to the Orient through the contact of the West with the East have led millions of people to see the folly and absurdity of their own religion and they have practically thrown it away. What is to take its place? Japan is looking for a religion and so also is China. The university education which England gives to millions of young men in India is purely secular without any Christ. Bismarck said years ago of the students of his nation, "One-third break down, one-third rot down, and one-third govern Germany." What is true in Germany will be true in India and unless we can give quickly to Japan and China and India the great truths of Christianity to take the place of that which they have discarded, their conditions will be worse than before and they will be much more difficult to reach.

There is another phase of this subject which it is most important for every student to remember and that is, *the importance of time*. The elements which make for unrighteousness are alert and everywhere busy. It is alarming to note during the past ten years the rapidity of the spread of Mohammedanism. It is like a rushing tide. There are great sections in North Africa which are being taken possession of in the interests of the Moslem world. That religion appeals to the passion of the African; he is easily influenced by what Mohammedanism promises, and unless the Christian Church bestirs itself, instead of contending with the simple and absurd religion of the heathen, we shall have to contend with the ignorance and fanaticism of the followers of Islam. These changes which are taking place so rapidly ought to be understood by every man who is to become a foreign missionary, since the difficulties of the situation are increased thereby.

Fifth. A new challenge to seminary men. All graduates of our theological seminaries cannot fail to note the wonderful uprising of laymen during the last two years in convention with the Laymen's Missionary Movement. Starting in November, 1906, in a prayer meeting in the city of New York, after the celebration of the Centennial of the Haystack Prayer-meeting, this

movement has gone almost like wildfire all over our own country and Canada, and is stirring also the men of Great Britain and Australia. Laymen's missionary movements in coöperation with the general movement have been started in various denominations, and many delegate meetings have been held of a thousand men and upwards, like the one last year in Chattanooga of the Southern Methodist Church. A few weeks ago I was again at a similar meeting at Birmingham, comprised of over eleven hundred delegates, representing the Presbyterian Church South. In some respects the most remarkable missionary meeting that has ever been held was the Congress at Toronto, Canada, March 31st to April 4th. About four thousand men were present representing every part of the Dominion and they unanimously accepted a National Missionary Policy voicing Canada's national and international religious obligations. It contemplates in the case of foreign missions an increase in the gifts of fourfold. Certainly the opening of the world everywhere, the new power which has come to every American missionary, followed by this wonderful uprising of laymen, brings a challenge and an obligation to seminary men such as there has never been before.

There is another call which every earnest soul must hear. It is the call which comes from the lack of men to even hold the ground that has been already opened. The missionaries at the front have seen the rapid growth of their work year by year, they have seen the hands outstretched for help, they have heard the pitiable cry for something better from thousands all about them. They note the lavish personal expenditure and the generous gifts for education and philanthropy in the home land. They turn to us and try to voice the cry of need they continually hear and it often seems to them as though the Churches mocked them. While they are dying at their posts because of overwork the reënforcements are delayed. Some of them have grown old in the service and have but a few more battles to fight before they hear the reveille call in another world.

With such conditions as this everywhere, we must look to seminaries like Hartford for the foreign missionaries that are so greatly needed. One of the great missionary leaders of the world, not a Congregationalist, told me a few weeks ago that he

had recently made an address in the West, in which he said there were two kinds of seminaries; one that has sky-lights only, the other has sky-lights and windows both, and he made a public statement that Hartford Seminary belonged especially in the latter class. His commendation was certainly just, for while Hartford has recognized that it is teaching the truth of God which is from above, yet it has had in its horizon the whole wide world. Here and everywhere the time has come when we need to lay the emphasis as much on the qualitative side of the men as upon the quantitative side, for it is the trained man who, as a general rule, makes the lasting impression.

Sixth. The foreign missionary problem at home. Of course all the graduates of our seminaries cannot go abroad. There is an equal need of trained men at home, and there is an equal responsibility resting upon the men who are to be pastors in the home Churches to be interested in world-wide missions. It has become almost an axiom in foreign missionary circles that our greatest foreign missionary problems are no longer in India or China or Turkey, but in the United States; the great problems abroad have been solved. But how to bring the greatness of the opportunity and the importance of the times in which we are living home to the men in our Churches so that they shall make larger response is the burning question. We must hide our heads in shame at the fact that the average gifts of the church members in this country for foreign missions is less than a dollar a year, or the value of a postage stamp a week. The men in the home Churches must reach these sluggish givers by presenting to them the claims of Jesus Christ and the obligations of stewardship. It is the pastor that must make this constant plea. Missionaries home on furlough cannot do it nor can the secretaries do it. It is not more exhortation that many men in our Churches need, but more education, and this must come through the pastors. To quote from Rev. Dr. Theodore T. Munger, "The weak spot in missions today is not in the field, nor in the administration of the Board, nor in the pews, but it is in the pulpit." The Church must be a missionary Church or die. This is its first duty. I lay this responsibility, therefore, upon the men who are graduating from our seminaries in this crucial hour in the

history of the world, and would repeat to them in all earnestness and sincerity the words of the late Charles Cuthbert Hall, "without the missionary passion they are not able to be ministers of the New Testament; they are disabled, deficient, half equipped; they lack the fullness of the spirit of Christ."

We rejoice in the record of Hartford Seminary in its foreign missionary interests. Some of our best men who are standing today on the far outposts, planting the cross in the darkest corners of the earth, are your own graduates. May the number of men and women increase who will give themselves without reserve to this work. It is a most sacred hour in the history of this seminary. Thurston and Seabury a little time ago and now Rogers are among those who in a few short years have died at their posts. Who of you are to fill in and close up the ranks? There is not an angel in heaven that would not rejoice to have your opportunity. May God help us all to put our lives in where they will count the most for the Kingdom of God. Christ is some day to be crowned as King. What part are we to have in that coronation?

ANNIVERSARY DINNER

Owing to the lack of room for the entertainment of so large a gathering in the Seminary buildings, the Anniversary dinner was held at the Hartford Golf Club. Dr. Mackenzie presided and introduced Dean Jacobus to speak as host of the evening.

Professor Jacobus, in connection with a cordial welcome to the guests of the evening, called attention to certain characteristics that had made themselves manifest throughout the life of the Seminary in its various phases, as it had moved from East Windsor Hill to Prospect Street, and thence to its present location. Each of these movements showed how the Seminary was possessed of the spirit of responsiveness to the movements of thought and life around it. The first move was at the close of the Civil War. It was made because Hartford responded to the self-consciousness that moved throughout the nation as the war was closing and realized in however confused a way, that there was life astir out of the death of those battle-fields. It was responsiveness to opportunity and to obligation, the responsiveness to the life and thought that moved about her.

The next move was during the significant advance in education and religion which this city experienced some thirty years ago,—when the High School was enlarging its quarters on the hill, the Y. M. C. A. securing its first home opposite the Seminary building on Prospect Street, and Trinity College moving out to its spacious campus at the head of Vernon Street. It was at this time that the Seminary responded to the impulses that were stirring the heart of the city, and moved out to the site which the munificence of one of Hartford's noble citizens made possible as its place of life and work. It was the responsiveness to greater opportunity and to more insistent obligation; for it brought the Seminary to a position where, set conspicuously as she was before the churches, the question with her must ever

be not what she was going to do for herself, but what she was going to do for the churches which had given her birth, and whose service was her only right to exist. This question is just as clearly in the life of Hartford today as it has ever been. Hartford has not believed that it had some peculiar sacrosanct vision of life, and attitude toward it. We know, just as our fellow ministers in the pulpit and parish know, life in its evil, in its sin, in its cry for peace, in its search for God, in its alienation from organized religion, in its outreaching for personal help. We know, too, just as our fellow ministers do, that all this death of the world's living is to be abolished only as there is ministered to it the truth which God has sent into the world through Jesus of Nazareth.

This truth is to be taken to a sinning and outreaching world wisely, frankly, fearlessly, sacrificially; but it is to be found first in that study of God's word that will make us know what truth is, in that experience of God's life and in that fellowship with God's self which will make us know what truth can do.

Hartford believes in life, in studying it, in saving it. This is what it tries to inspire men to do, and saddened though it is in its Anniversary days with the news of fire and sword that comes out from the mission fields of the far East, it is thankful that the men it sends out do not fear to give their lives if need be for the service of their Lord.

Letters were read bearing the regrets and good wishes of invited guests and there followed the responses of invited institutions which were represented.

In behalf of Andover, the oldest of the Seminaries, Professor Platner spoke as charged to extend congratulations on the occasion and on the really great service Hartford has rendered to the Churches and on the comparative peace in which this service has been rendered, holding to the old and recognizing the need of an efficient faculty and methods of instruction. In the historic sequence of the schools of theology in New England Hartford is the fifth and ends the period of creative institutional life for theological education in New England. This, as

the other institutions, was established because of theological differences and for the sake of a theology. The cause has gone; what of the future outcome? The change in the cause will doubtless transform the school. Andover has been the first to change, as it first came into being. The future will tell the result. It would not appear strange if seventy-five years hence there should be manifest a still greater consolidation. Andover sends to Hartford its hearty good wishes, its love, its confidence and its esteem on this occasion.

In behalf of Yale Professor Walker spoke and called attention to the fact that Taylor and Tyler were both Yale graduates, and Hartford thus withdrew from the mother of both. But it is to be believed that Taylor and Tyler have long ago adjusted their differences, whatever they were, in an upper and better kingdom. At the present time, though intended to be markedly different, the striking thing is the immense similarity between Yale and Hartford. They sprang from the same root, they are impelled by the same sense of desire for service, they both hold up to a material world the verities of God, and they both strive to train men for a common service. Yale would congratulate Hartford on its history, is glad that it can get on so well alone, and feels confidence in the future.

President King of Oberlin, in bringing the greetings of that Seminary, called attention to the fact that such gatherings brought to mind three phases in the lives of the theological seminaries. The first was the phase of hostility when each was in violent antagonism to the other. The second was the phase of ignorance, when each knew little of what the others were doing; the third was the stage of sensitiveness, each watchful of its own achievements and insistent on its individuality; the fourth, where the Seminaries recognize that they are members one of another — inevitably to be sure, but none the less gladly. This is the true attitude. This does not mean a dead level of opinion. Each should speak its truth with whatever differences it expresses; but each should show tolerance for the views of the others. Tolerance should not be confused with indifference. There is

no tolerance without conviction. With the freest tolerance, may God save us from indifference. Hartford is to be congratulated that it has something to stand for, and on what it has been able to do. May she be faithful to her trust.

President Davis of Chicago Theological Seminary, speaking in behalf of that institution, found that he must speak with a strange mingling of emotions. He could hardly speak for Chicago alone, so brief as yet had been his connection with it, and so intimate has been the connection of it with Hartford. Taylor had gone from the professorship in Hartford and had held the position of acting President of Chicago, and Mackenzie had come to the Presidency of Hartford from the Chicago professorship. It is to be hoped that the occupancy of the President's chair of Chicago by one who has been a graduate, fellow and trustee of Hartford may make still closer that connection. Together may both have courage to stand for an educated ministry and for instruction in the fundamentals of theology. Thus can each institution be true to the fathers. Let the two institutions understand each other. Let each develop its individuality, recognizing that the welfare of each is the welfare of all. Let there be no rivalry except efficiently to serve the churches. So shall both institutions vindicate the hopes of those who founded them.

President Brown brought hearty greetings from Union Seminary as from a younger sister produced from the same stock and by the same influences that brought into being the New England Seminaries. Hartford as a separate theological seminary has showed the power to develop its own life without association with university influence and is to be congratulated on what it has achieved. The associations of Union and Hartford through Schaff, H. B. Smith, and Karr have historically been close, and there is consequently a peculiar pleasure in noting how the institution has justified itself through its efficiency in education and publication. No institution of theology can flourish whose teachers cease thinking. But men cannot think earnestly and vigorously without progress. Books are the result of a living power in the minds of those who think. But the work of the thinker and the writer alone is not enough; we

crave evidence of practical efficiency. We want to know what is the result of thinking and writing in the life of the Church and of the world. In this work of thought and teaching and service Hartford and Union are unitedly employed. They are both striving to reform the world into the image of Jesus Christ. This must be the true ideal of every Theological Seminary.

Dean Shailer Mathews of the Divinity School of Chicago University congratulated Hartford because it has performed the main function of a Theological Seminary, in sending out ministers. It is for this that a seminary is planted, and it is in this that it finds its chief claim for the perpetuation of its existence. The minister must speak and he must speak his message. It is not something that he has simply learned. It must have become part of his character, it must be in the soul of the man. He must have a message that touches the inner life of other men. We have got to teach sinners to be nervous about their sins. The Seminary must send out men feeling that they have a Divinity, and able to make others recognize that they stand in His presence.

New Brunswick presented its felicitations through Professor Johnson. The History of Hartford makes greetings from the Dutch Church peculiarly appropriate. It is the greeting of the oldér to the later settlers. The relations of New Brunswick and Hartford have always been most friendly. It was from the pastorate of a Dutch Reformed Church that Dr. Hartranft came into official relations to this institution. The Reformed Church is always glad to welcome pastors who have had the Hartford training. Especially noteworthy has been the "Humaneness" of the instructors of Hartford. They have seemed to stand in the true relation to their students, and as elder brothers have striven to lead their younger brethren into the realms of truth.

Dr. J. P. Jones of Pasumalai College, India, brought the greetings of the far East to the training school of the West. In behalf of the East he would thank Hartford for its noble work in the missionary cause. The Seminary has done nothing

better than this work. He would thank it for the training it has given to the missionary, for the men sent to the field. In the name of all the Theological Seminaries on the mission field he would express gratitude to Hartford.

Professor Kilpatrick of Knox College, Toronto, had noted with gladness the fine quality of independence and conviction which he had observed in Hartford. Canada has been leading on before the United States in the matter of the union of different denominations, and the subordination of the incidentals of mere polity and ecclesiastical organization to the profound and unified convictions of the Christian faith. Hartford Seminary is to be congratulated on its President, whose history and character so well illustrate this quality of the union of strong convictions with willingness to cooperate with others for the great truths of the Christian faith. It is to be congratulated on its superb library which makes a visitor envious of the opportunities for scholarly research which it affords.

Professor Carrier of McCormick found himself for almost the first time at a Seminary gathering since he graduated twenty-five years ago. He was glad to note the new sense of power, the new capacity for achievement, the rich life which he found growing here. It is the old institution strengthening with the new inflowing life of the passing years.

In behalf of the graduating class of the Seminary Howard A. Walter expressed the gratitude of his fellows for all that they had received of intellectual stimulus, and intellectual acquisition; but chief of all for the fact that through the life of the classroom and through the impulse of the institution the men had found themselves brought in contact with the great spiritual realities and had found themselves face to face with God.

Dr. Robert F. Horton of London said that he stood to bring the greetings of eleven institutions for the training of ministers on the other side of the water. He had at the last National Congregational Council in Edinburgh noted what seemed to him a reversal of the relation of Great Britain and the United States

as compared with the former Council, held in Boston. Then it appeared that to Great Britain belonged the leadership of thought, but now it appeared that the United States had come to occupy that position. Take heed, then, whither that leadership directs. It is a serious thing when the child shall teach the parent. Lead forward then, I beg of you, not simply on. Do not let go of the cross, do not abandon the divinity of the Christ. Do not forget that we are sinners, needing to be cleansed. May the opulent and optimistic daughter over the sea not lead the parent in any but the true paths. The danger of the present time is that we shall be demoralized by our own comfort. Our pleasures bulk largely even in our religion. The temptations of prosperous business press in upon us. May no desire of ease, no lack of courage, no failure in love delay our onward steps to the apprehension and the practice of the supreme life of the sacrificial Christ.

ARRANGEMENT OF CONTENTS

ANNIVERSARY PROGRAM

Historical Address,	<i>Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Mus.D.</i>
Hartford Alumni in Foreign Missions,	<i>Rev. James L. Barton, D.D.</i>
Hartford Alumni in Home Missions,	<i>Rev. Henry H. Kelsey</i>
Hartford Seminary in Teaching,	<i>Prof. Williston Walker, D.D.</i>
Hartford Seminary in Literature,	<i>Prof. Ernest C. Richardson, Ph.D.</i>
Hartford Alumni in the Pulpit,	<i>Rev. Nicholas Van der Pyl</i>

GRADUATING EXERCISES

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Present Task of the Ministry, *Pres. Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.*

SCHOOL OF RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY

The Moral and Religious Challenge of Our Times,

Pres. Henry C. King, LL.D.

CONFERENCE ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The Bible, *Prof. T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D.*

The Essential Message, *Pres. Ozora S. Davis, D.D.*

The Curriculum of a Theological Seminary,

Dean Shailer Mathews, D.D.

Theological Education and Spiritual Life, *Rev. J. P. Jones, D.D.*

CONFERENCE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Field of Religious Education, *Rev. H. F. Cope*

The Church and Religious Education,

Pres. W. H. P. Faunce, LL.D.

The Training of the Teacher,

Rev. Franklin McElfresh

PUBLIC CELEBRATION

The Seminary and the Wide Movements of Religion,

Rev. R. F. Horton, D.D.

The Seminary and the City,

Rev. R. H. Potter, D.D.

The Seminary and the Nation,

Rev. Hubert Herring, D.D.

The Seminary and the World,

Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D.

ANNIVERSARY DINNER

Welcome to Guests

Greetings of Guests

THE
HARTFORD SEMINARY RECORD

VOL. XIX. No. 4—OCTOBER, 1909

[Entered at the Hartford Post Office as Second Class Matter.]

Published quarterly in January, April, July, and October. Subscription price, \$1.00 per year, in advance. Single copies, 30 cents. Remit to order of HARTFORD SEMINARY PRESS, Hosmer Hall, Hartford, Conn.

EDITORIAL BOARD:—Professor Arthur Lincoln Gillett, Professor Waldo Selden Pratt, Professor Austin Bradley Bassett. *Business Manager*:—Eugene Barnard Smith.

The July number of THE RECORD was, in the number of pages it presented to its readers, practically a double number. From it were therefore, of necessity, omitted the various departments that customarily appear in the magazine. It was accordingly purposed in this number to present the other matter that would usually appear in the two final numbers of the year, omitting the contributed articles. Various circumstances of an untoward nature have prevented the appearance of this number till this late date. With the beginning of the twentieth volume in January it is hoped that it will be possible to issue the magazine on the fifteenth of January, April, July and October, as has been our previous aim.

Not the least notable event in connection with the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Seminary was the preparation, and publication during the summer, of the Commemorative Volume on *Recent Christian Progress*, containing studies in Christian thought and work during the last seventy-five years by Professors and Alumni of Hartford Seminary. When the project was first broached the fear was expressed that such a volume would simply

contribute one more to the collections of rather miscellaneous essays which such occasions frequently elicit, whose significance vanishes with the occasion which called them forth. Under the careful editorship of Professor Paton, and through the cordial and efficient coöperation of the seventy-seven contributors a volume has been produced which, by its comprehensiveness of scope, through its well ordered material, and because of the special familiarity of the writers with the fields treated, provides not only a significant illustration of the wide-reaching effectiveness of the life of an institution training for the ministry; but also supplies both an interesting survey of the field of theological science and a reference book of permanent value respecting the history and development of modern theological thought and Christian activity. The Macmillan Company have done their part, as publishers, in making the book attractive in form, easily read and comfortably handled, for all of its five hundred and ninety-six pages; while a careful table of contents and index makes its rich material easily accessible. It can be secured of the Hartford Seminary Press for three dollars, postpaid.

It is with great regret that we are obliged to announce that President Mackenzie has been constrained to prolong his rest in Great Britain through the remainder of this year. An exceptionally heavy tale of work, culminating in the exhausting labors connected with the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Seminary, left him with depleted vitality, and led the Trustees at the Commencement meeting to counsel him to take six months leave of absence at least, and as much more as might be necessary to secure his full restoration to vigorous health. At their fall meeting the Trustees again communicated with him urging upon him the importance of delaying his return till he was once more in full strength, and to remain away throughout this year rather than to return with any danger of again overtasking his strength in the work of the Seminary. Following the advice of English physicians he has with reluctance yielded to the solicitation of the Trustees to keep well within the bounds of prudence, and has decided to remain abroad this winter. Steps have been

taken toward supplying instruction for his classes, though the final arrangements have not yet been made.

Two interesting incidents have occurred in connection with the publication of theological magazines. The first is the issuing by the *Hibbert Journal* of what may be called a supplemental volume with the purpose of pushing to the fore the discussion respecting the distinction between Jesus and Christ. The other is the trying position in which the *Biblical World* has found itself owing, in large measure, to the perversity of the daily press in the use of headlines. Both these incidents have value for clarifying the thought of men. The second has provided the *Biblical World* with an excellent opportunity to set forth what may fairly be called the creed of Higher Criticism in respect to the Bible. It is a creed to which all Christians should be able to subscribe, though one to which many might wish to add articles; but a creed which only ignorance or perversity could construe into an attack upon the Bible. The volume offered by the *Hibbert Journal*, in both its radical and more conservative contributions, will prove serviceable not only for what it contains but for the discussion it will evoke as to the relation of the historic Jesus to the historic religion known as Christianity.

Readers of this volume will find themselves facing the most profoundly significant problem for the thought and experience of the modern Christian. Jesus of Nazareth has been looked upon throughout the ages as the exalted founder of the highest, purest, most expansive religion that the world has ever known. It is as both the founder and object of this religion that he has been placed in a position of unique pre-eminence among the religious teachers of the world. It has been believed that the beneficent life of the Christian Church has been due to the fact that in thought and conduct it has embodied the reality of Jesus. And now the question comes to the fore "Has this religious experience of the individual Christian, which collectively has constituted the life of the Christian Church, really rested back, not on the real Jesus, but on an ideal Christ altogether different?"

If this is so the conclusion is frequently drawn that our ideas as to the truth and value of historic Christianity must be entirely reconstructed. But the question may with equal propriety be urged, "If this is true must not our estimate of the truth and value of Jesus be entirely reconstructed?" The person whose real nature could vitalize and uplift the religious consciousness of a world is worthy of adoration; but how about the person whose reality could accomplish nothing of the sort and whose supposed efficiency for this end was secured only through a false, though lofty, idealizing of his real nature? It is difficult to say with one breath "Jesus of Nazareth is the founder of Christianity, therefore Christianity must go back to Him;" and with the next breath to assert "Christianity is not founded on Jesus but on an idealized Christ, and consequently the peculiar religious experience which has made it what it is must be abandoned." It is well to note that to assert the essential difference of Jesus and Christ is to draw a sword that may cut both ways. It may slay historic Christianity, or it may slay the historic Jesus.

In the Book-World

INDEX TO PERIODICAL ARTICLES ON RELIGION.

This scholarly and exhaustive work was undertaken by Dr. Richardson, Librarian of Princeton University, as a result of the urgent presentation of the need for such an index made to the Coöperative Committee of the American Library Association while he was Chairman.

The well-known Poole alphabetical method with several improvements, was used. The most important of these improvements, as noted in the Preface, are: brief definitions of the subject headings, a good cyclopædia reference to which the reader may turn for general information on the subject; the giving of author and title in the ordinary form, the articles being arranged under their subjects in the alphabetical order of authors; the giving of the date as well as the volume of the publication; and finally the giving the reference to the last page as well as to the first.

There seems little room for question that experience has proved the Poole method superior to any form of classified index, though in the case of such a work as this a greater use of cross-references would add materially to its utility. The improvements on, or rather additions to, the plan of Mr. Poole which have been adopted for this book add greatly to its value and serviceability. Especially to be commended, are the references to encyclopædias, the giving of the date as well as the volume, and the giving of both initial and final page numbers. Though the idea of defining the subject heading is a good one in general, yet often such definition seems superfluous. Opinion, however, would differ so widely as to what subjects could safely be left undefined that probably uniformity in practice is preferable.

One is impressed with the judgment and discrimination with which the subject headings have been chosen, though one cannot

* An alphabetical subject index and index encyclopædia to periodical articles on religion, 1890-1899, compiled and edited by Ernest Cushing Richardson, with the coöperation of Charles S. Thayer, William C. Hawks, Paul Martin, and various members of the Faculty of the Hartford Theological Seminary, and some help from A. D. Savage, Solon Librescot and many others. New York: Published for the Hartford Seminary Press by Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. xlii, 1168. \$10.

but wish that the editors had not been so sparing in the matter of cross-references. One wishes too that the Poole plan had been further modified so as to admit the indexing of authors as well as of subjects. To do this would have added tremendously to the size of the book, however, and possibly without a proportionate gain. On the whole, the editors have performed their task with so great judgment, painstaking, and accuracy that any cavilling seems ungracious.

Merely to state the plan and scope of such a work, is to a considerable extent to indicate its value. Yet the full force of this does not dawn on one till he realizes that the list of periodicals indexed occupies some thirty-five closely printed pages, and includes some fifteen hundred publications; and that there are upward of fifty thousand articles thus made available. Thousands of valuable studies are saved from oblivion by this book and added to the working apparatus of the theologian, the historian, and the student of the social sciences, for the work will be valuable to men in these and many other widely differing lines of research.

The mere manual labor involved in the collecting, arranging, and printing of such a vast number of facts, each one requiring great care and accuracy in statement, as well as great judgment in assigning it to its proper pigeonhole, is simply appalling. One cannot realize it until he has attempted a similar task; such work is never appreciated at its true value. We make use of such tools every day of our lives with never a thought of the patient compiler whose drudgery and devotion have made our study so much easier and more fruitful. To compile such a work of reference as this is truly a yeoman task, and necessarily a labor of love, for of course there can be no pecuniary reward at all commensurate with the time and labor involved. Dr. Richardson and his able fellow workers have added another indispensable tool to the working equipment of the student of theology and the social sciences, and has earned the gratitude of all who are zealous for the preservation and advancement of learning.

ARTHUR ADAMS.

Trinity College.

The One Volume Bible Commentary, edited by Rev. J. R. Dummelow of Queen's College, Cambridge, is a work that well deserves the careful attention of Bible students. The term "Commentary" does not designate quite accurately the whole scope of the work, since it contains a large amount of general information on topics connected, more or less closely, with the Bible which do not necessarily belong to a commentary. This material is contained in a series of "General Articles," twenty-nine in number, occupying the first one hundred pages of the work. In this

division of the book such topics as "The Creation Story and Science," "Genesis and the Babylonian Inscriptions," "The Laws of Hammurabi," "The Messianic Hope," "The Teaching of Jesus Christ," "The Synoptic Problem," "Belief in God," "Inspiration," and many others equally important are discussed, briefly, it must be admitted, yet on the whole in a very satisfactory manner. It will become quite evident to the reader of these articles that he is dealing with a modern book, but the modernism is not captious or sceptical, but reverent and sincere. The almost complete absence of anything that savors of a polemical or controversial spirit is a most commendable feature. When we pass to the Commentary proper, the same reverential open-mindedness is everywhere evidenced. The most valuable portions of this Commentary are the respective Introductions to the different books of the Bible. Taken together, these furnish the ordinary Bible student's quite complete "Introduction" to the Bible, scholarly and up-to-date, often placing before the reader several possible conclusions as to the date, authorship, etc., of certain books without attempting to pronounce a final judgment on the questions in dispute. As to the comments on the Bible text, the most serious handicap to the usefulness of the work is, doubtless, the extreme brevity necessitated by lack of space. The six hundred odd pages given to the Old Testament and the nearly five hundred to the New for purposes of both Introduction and Commentary are, in fact, very few. To require an exegete to limit his comments on the forty-two chapters of Job to what he can say in twenty-eight pages is to ask the impossible; to comment satisfactorily on the one hundred and fifty Psalms in sixty pages is beyond human ability. These limitations must be recognized and the book must not be expected to furnish a complete commentary on the Bible. Under the circumstances the various editors have done most excellent work.

It is hardly necessary to add that the list of contributors to this volume seems to have been selected with care and wisdom. We are especially pleased to find our own Prof. Paton among the number. (Macmillan, pp. ciii, 1901. \$2.50 net.)

E. E. N.

Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, by Professor W. G. Jordan of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada, consists of nine lectures given in Queen's University in 1906 and 1907, together with some articles and papers that have appeared in various magazines. The author regards the modern theory of the development of the Old Testament as thoroughly established. His concern is not so much to prove this position as to show how it may be correlated with modern thought in science and in theology. It is necessary occasionally to consider view-points which regard modern Biblical criticism as essentially destructive, and so to answer Dr. Orr and other reactionary writers of the last few years. But as a whole, the book aims to be constructive rather than polemical, and to help that large class of students who are intellectually convinced of the truth of the modern positions, but fear that they cannot be utilized in the practical life of the Church. To all such this work will come as a guide and helper. No book has appeared since Professor George Adam Smith's "Higher Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament," which exhibits so admirably the positive contributions of criticism to Christian faith and

apologetics. Professor Jordan discusses first, the present outlook for Old Testament interpretation, then the problem which the Old Testament presents to the scientific mind, and the way in which that problem is solved by higher criticism. He next discusses the relation of the new discoveries in Biblical science to the discoveries in archæology and comparative religion, and shows how the modern view enables one to correlate one's conception of the Bible with one's conceptions in the other sciences. Finally, in the concluding four chapters he exhibits the way in which critical results may be utilized in theology, in preaching, and in Christian ethics. This book is to be welcomed as a timely contribution to the recent efforts to make Biblical criticism practical, on whose success the ultimate triumph of the critical views in the Church must depend. (Imported by Scribner, pp. 322. \$3.00 net.)

L. B. P.

The reign of Artaxerxes III (Ochus) is involved in more obscurity than any other period in Persian history, both on account of the untrustworthy character of the sources, and on account of the uncertainty as to what documents are to be assigned to the reign of this king. The problem of this period has been investigated in a very thorough manner in a treatise entitled *Artaxerxes III, Ochus, and his Reign*, by Noah Calvin Hirschy, which has been accepted as a dissertation for the degree of Ph.D. by the University of Berne, and has just been published by the University of Chicago Press. The author begins with a preliminary historical survey of the history from Achæmenes down to Ochus, and then gives a thorough study of the historical sources for the reign of Ochus, and the history of his reign as based upon these sources. Finally, he discusses the passages of the Old Testament which by various critics have been assigned to the reign of Ochus, reaching the following conclusion: "As certainly dating from the reign of Ochus are Isa. 23:1-14 and Isa. 19:1-15. Trito-Isaiah very probably also comes from the same time. Not certain, yet probable, are Ps. 44, 74, 79, and 83, as subjective presentations of the same historic situation as that which Trito-Isaiah gives us. The Book of Judith does not come from this time, but has its background in the history of the reign of Ochus and reflects confirming light upon it. In Isa. 14: 28-32 there are probably also to be found reflections of the campaigns of Ochus in Palestine, though the passage does not date from that reign. Of the remaining passages considered none yield sufficiently clear evidence to justify their acceptance for sources of the history of the reign of Ochus, although in the case of some it is equally impossible to say that they do not date from this period.

"Isa. 23:1-14 corroborates the history of the campaign of Ochus against Sidon, and Isa. 19:1-15 the impending campaign against Egypt, as we have found them recorded in extra-biblical history. Isa., chapters 56-66, shows us the relation between Jews and Samaritans during the close of the Persian period, their long-continued hatred, and their final separation resulting from the building of the temple on Mount Gerizim soon after the close of the reign of Ochus. Not only have we in Trito-Isaiah confirming evidence of the history of the reign of Ochus as we found it elsewhere, but it gives us a clearer picture of what the Jews suffered at the hands of Ochus. This suffering is presented more

intensely in the Psalms probably dating from this time. The presentation is more intense because it is subjectively contemplated. A later reflection of the same history appears in the Book of Judith." (University of Chicago Press, pp. 85. \$1.00 net.)

L. B. P.

Fifty years ago the problem of the relation of the first chapter of Genesis to modern science was eagerly discussed, and it was felt that the authority of the Bible depended upon our ability to reconcile the statements of its opening chapter with astronomy and geology. Many scientists were convinced that the Bible and science were irreconcilable, and that, therefore, the Bible must be rejected. Many Christians also believed that they were irreconcilable, and that therefore science must be rejected. Others endeavored so to interpret both science and the Bible as to bring them into harmony with one another. Among the numerous attempts of this sort one of the most popular was that of Hugh Miller, in which he sought to interpret Genesis 1 in terms of geology, by assuming that it was not intended to record the beginning of things in their chronological order, but only the order in which they would have appeared to an observer stationed on the earth. Thus, when the creation of light is placed after the creation of heaven and earth, this is assumed to mean that thick clouds covering the surface of the earth shut out light from the observer, until these clouds began to condense; and that the words, "Let there be light!" mean that at this point light was first observed by the supposed beholder. In like manner, when the sun, moon and stars are said to have been created after the dry land and the plants on the fourth day, this means that the clouds which enveloped the earth did not lift sufficiently for sun, moon and stars to be seen until the fourth epoch of creation. This view, with slight modifications, is the one adopted by David L. Holbrook in *The Panorama of Creation*.

The discussion is interesting, and there is a frank attitude toward physical science that is not found in many of the older apologetes. Nevertheless, discussions of this sort have lost their significance and their interest for our generation. Modern criticism has shown that the second chapter of Genesis contains an independent, and very different, story of creation from that found in chapter 1. If by the use of some theory, like the one here presented, Genesis 1 can be twisted into accord with astronomy and geology, what good does this do, when in Gen. 2 we have another account of creation, which by no stretch of ingenuity can be brought into accord with science, inasmuch as it is anti-evolutional, making creation begin at the top and proceed downward? The critical analysis of the book of Genesis has thus cut the ground from under the old-fashioned apologetic by making its arguments useless in the case of Gen. 1, inasmuch as it can do nothing with the duplicate account in Gen. 2.

Moreover, the last twenty-five years have brought the clear recognition that Gen. 1 is derived from a Babylonian source. Mr. Holbrook remarks that there is a more intimate relation between Genesis and geology than there is between Genesis and the Babylonian tablets. Most students will question the correctness of this statement. The fact is, that Gen. 1 is in close and detailed dependence upon the Babylonian creation-

tablets, while it can be brought into accord with geology only by juggling with the facts both of exegesis and of geology. The question nowadays which interests scholars is no longer, what is the relation of Gen. 1 to geology, but what is its relation to that older Babylonian civilization, which we now know was the intellectual mould in which the religious thought of the Old Testament was cast. There is no reason why an ancient Sumerian epic of creation should correspond with the facts of modern physical science; and if the Hebrew narrative in Gen. 1 was derived from this source, there is no reason why the new religious spirit which its author has breathed into it should guarantee its scientific correctness. The fact is, that modern thought has got over looking for confirmations of the scientific accuracy of the Old Testament. It knows that the science of the Old Testament is the science of the ancient Orient, and that it does not correspond at any point with modern discovery; but while it recognizes this, it at the same time perceives that the intellectual form in which the religious faith of Israel expressed itself is not an essential part of that faith. The form of statement in which faith utters itself from age to age may constantly change, yet the substance of that faith remains always the same. (S. S. Times Co., pp. 87.) L. B. P.

To the list of works, now becoming quite numerous, on the history of the Jews in the period just preceding the Christian era, a valuable addition has been made by Rev. W. Fairweather in his volume of Cunningham Lectures entitled *The Background of the Gospels*. A thorough understanding of the so-called "intertestamental" period is now generally admitted to be essential to a proper appreciation of the New Testament. But, owing chiefly to the fact that the literature belonging to this period of Jewish history, except that comprised in the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, is not generally known or easily accessible, it is safe to say that the great majority, even of Bible students, know very little about the complex, but interesting and important, developments in the thought and life of the Jews, both in and out of Palestine, which formed the transition from an old era to a new one in the midst of which the Christian religion had its origin.

The task to which a historian sets himself in attempting to describe the Judaism of the two pre-Christian centuries is not an easy one. The information we possess is full for only certain periods. The literature is full of perplexity, especially that part of it generally designated "Apocalyptic," in which fact and fancy, history of the past and forecasting of the future, are at times fused into one. It is a field that offers great temptations to all kinds of wild conjectures or shrewd combinations of the evidence which the historian who makes them may easily mistake for history. It is therefore a satisfaction to be able to commend a work on this period as well-balanced, painstaking and accurate. Such is the work here noticed. It cannot be called brilliant, and it is also not marked by great originality. The writer has leaned heavily on the other workers in the same field. But he knows how to discriminate, and also knows when to suspend judgment if the evidence is insufficient.

In one place we have noticed a serious departure from this careful weighing of conflicting theories. This is on p. 127, where we read the

surprising statement: "The glowing eulogy of Eccclus. I 1-21 seems best applied to him" (*i. e.*, Simon the Asmonean, 142-135 B. C.). The only evidence adduced for this identification is in a note in the Appendix, where a reference is made to the altogether arbitrary and conjectural text-emendation proposed by N. Schmidt that the original Hebrew of the passage was "Simon, the high-priest," to which was added later, "son of Mattathias, son of Johanan." It is strange that Mr. Fairweather did not reckon with the fact that the date of Ecclesiasticus (at least a generation before 132 B. C.) makes such an identification impossible.

To all who would inform themselves regarding the "background of the Gospels," this book can be commended as perhaps the best general discussion in English of recent date. (Imported by Scribner, pp. xiii, 456. \$3.00 net.) E. E. N.

The volume on *The Acts* in "The Bible for Home and School" is edited by Dr. George Holley Gilbert. The only reasonable objection that can be raised against this new series of brief commentaries is that they are too small to be able to be of great service to the Bible student. Obviously, the editors of the respective volumes must have before them, as their chief tasks, the selection of the most important of the passages or expressions needing elucidation and the compression of their comments into the smallest compass. These limitations, imposed by the plan of the series, have not prevented Dr. Gilbert from producing a very useful and helpful commentary, which will hold its place with honor alongside of the similar commentary by J. Vernon Bartlett in the *New Century Bible*. The Introduction contains a brief but good defense of the Lukan authorship of Acts. (Macmillan Co., pp. 267. 75c.) E. E. N.

The distinguishing feature of Mr. Rutherford's work entitled *St. Paul's Epistles to Colossæ and Laodicea* is well stated in its sub-title, "The Epistle to the Colossians viewed in relation to the Epistle to the Ephesians."

The Introduction covers the ground one would expect to be covered in a commentary on Colossians. The author ably defends the theory that the epistle to the Ephesians is really a circular letter sent by Paul to the churches of Asia at the same time that he sent the letter to the Colossians, and that it is this circular letter that is referred to in Col. iv. 16 as "the epistle from Laodicea."

The commentary proper is much more a commentary on the portions of Colossians common to it and Ephesians than a commentary on Colossians alone. Herein lies the special value of this book. The entire Greek text of Colossians is printed and in parallel columns the Greek text of those passages in Ephesians which are verbally similar. This is followed by a translation of the parallel columns, and also of Colossians alone. The notes are limited almost exclusively to the material common to the two epistles.

This work therefore furnishes a most valuable aid to the study of these two epistles, and is really worth the price charged for it which at first sight seems extraordinarily high. Typographically, the book is far and away beyond most commentaries. The type both English and Greek,

is large and clear, giving a pleasing, attractive appearance to the printed page all too rare in commentaries. (Imported by Scribner, pp. 207. \$2.25 net.)

E. E. N.

The Book of Revelation continues to attract and fascinate. There is a class of Bible students who endeavor to find its "key" and when they have persuaded themselves that they have discovered this they proceed to unlock the secrets of the book. The numerous attempts to do this, resulting in as many failures, are all too well known. Scholars today generally recognize the fact that Revelation, like Daniel, is but one, although a most worthy one, of a number of Apocalypses which were put forth in the general period 200 B. C.-150 A. D., and that a great deal in this book must be interpreted in the light of the general facts and principles peculiar to this class of literature. Only thus can one feel the ground beneath his feet as he tries to understand such a book.

But there are those who discard all such methods as opposed to the strict, practically literal, view of inspiration which they think it is necessary to hold. These try to apply the principle, "Scripture is to be interpreted (only) by Scripture," a principle which, when applied to such a book as Revelation, will call for more than human skill and ingenuity to make all things harmonize. Such an attempt, very honestly, carefully and conscientiously carried out, the interested reader will find in *The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ*, by W. W. Mead. Whether the reader will know any more about the real meaning of Revelation when he lays down this book, we very much doubt. (W. W. Mead, N. Y., pp. iv, 337.)

E. E. N.

In his *Epochs in the Life of Paul*, Dr. A. T. Robertson gives a bright, readable study of the life-work of the great Apostle. The book is a good example of competent scholarship placed at the service of the ordinary Bible student. Technical discussions are largely avoided. The problems which are involved in the record of Paul's work in the New Testament are not concealed from the reader, but the solution which the writer adopts is always clearly and frankly, though not offensively, stated. Dr. Robertson holds to the Lukan authorship of Acts and to the essential harmony of Luke's record with Paul's own testimony in the epistles. He also holds to the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, dating them between the first and the (assumed) second imprisonments. He writes with enthusiasm, fascinated by his subject and eager to win his readers to the same eager, enthusiastic admiration of Paul. At times this leads him to an affectation of a popular, oratorical style that is not quite in harmony with the fundamentally scientific character of the work.

The "epochs" practically include the whole of Paul's career, not selected portions as one might suppose. The book does not throw any new light on the Pauline problems. Its positions are generally those of the conservative wing of New Testament scholars. But for this reason it should prove a good, useful book for those who wish to learn about Paul as the New Testament presents him, but are not over-anxious to know the very latest theories of German criticism regarding him. Dr. Robertson shows that he is well acquainted with these theories, but they have not shaken his faith in the record of the New Testament. (Scribner, pp. 331. \$1.25.)

E. E. N.

In the series entitled "Anglican Church Handbooks," Canon Girdlestone has written the volume on *Old Testament Theology*. The author is one of the group of British scholars who gave us, some years since, the volume of essays entitled "Lex Mosaica," in which the attempt was made to refute the view of the Old Testament represented by modern critical scholarship.

The same blindly conservative view is maintained by the author in his present volume. Consequently, what we read in it is not really Old Testament theology, *i. e.*, the religious life and thought of ancient Israel as this found expression in the Old Testament, but a system of theology, much of which, as here set forth, no man in ancient Israel had any conception of whatever. Not that many of the separate ideas were not known, some to one, some to another, of the Old Testament writers. But the system as a whole, as presented in this book, was never the system of the thinkers of ancient Israel. When a man says "the Book of Genesis was . . . Israel's . . . first manual of theology" (p. 36), he throws to the winds all that has been learned of Israel's early history and of her literature during the past one hundred years. (Longmans, pp. 128. 40c.)

E. E. N.

Three further volumes of the "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series have reached us. One of these is in every way worthy of the reputation of the series and of the lamented scholar in whose memory it was founded. It is the first volume of Yaqut's great dictionary of scholars—a companion work to his geographical dictionary—and is edited with much care and skill by Professor D. S. Margoliouth. Our only criticism of it is that the editor has been too sparing of vowels; the verses, at least, might have been vocalized much more freely. The reading of such a book as this should not be made a linguistic exercise but an unhampered pleasure. On another side it was only fitting that in this volume, as in others of the series, the assistance of native oriental scholars was utilized. A great part of Mr. Gibb's life was given to drawing together the East and the West, and much of his peculiar excellence as a scholar was derived from his close personal contact with eastern life and thought.

Of the other two volumes—the second volume of the translation of al-Khazraji's History of the Rasūli dynasty in Yemen, the first volume of which we have already noticed, and a volume of annotation, both by the late Sir J. W. Redhouse—it is unfortunate that the same terms of praise cannot be used. They are undoubtedly of interest, as a translation of almost any Arabic text must be, but they are not worthy of a place in this series. Nor can the excuse for their reception be regarded as valid which has been urged by Professor E. G. Browne, the general editor. If the funds of the Gibb trust must be expended yearly, there are other and far more important undertakings to which it could apply its resources. The Mohammedan Encyclopædia, for example, is almost on the rocks for lack of money, and the edition of the works of Avicenna, projected by Dr. Horton of Bonn, has apparently had to be abandoned for the same reason. Again, it is years since Dr. Abel announced that he had ready complete concordances to the Five Dīwāns and the Hanāsa; these have never appeared. With such possibilities, and there must be

many more, the waste of money on this book has been most unhappy. (London: Luzac & Co., 1907, 1908.)

D. B. M.

As the appearance of the above notice was accidentally delayed, there must now be added to it mention of two further volumes in the series. One of these is the second volume of *Yaqut* and carries the biographies to the end of the letter *Jim*. To it applies what has been said above of the first volume. The editing has been done with really extraordinary skill. For details of criticism—out of place here—reference can be made to the long review by Goldziher in the July number of the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society." The other is the first volume of a work of at least equal interest, the great *Universal History* of Ibn Miskawayh. This is fac-similed from a photograph made for the Principe di Teano of the only complete manuscript known, which is preserved in the Mosque Library of Santa Sophia. The photograph unfortunately was not very carefully made and in consequence the reading of this text is often by no means easy. Its use, however, is enormously helped by a careful twenty page summary of the contents and an index of nearly forty pages. Ibn Miskawayh, who was of Persian origin and of strong Persian sympathies, died in the year of the Hijra 421. He lived and wrote under the protection of the Persian and Shi'ite Buwayhids and, in consequence, was able to speak his mind with freedom. And he had ideas to express. His History is no mere chronicle or collection of materials, but an attempt at an organic structure, most striking for its early date—nearly four centuries before Ibn Khaldun founded the science of the philosophy of history. It is interesting to observe how healthy is his feeling towards the mass of theological legend that so oppresses the earlier parts of all other Muslim universal histories. But when he cuts his account of the life of Muhammad down to twenty pages, we have not science, but Persian nationalism; and when he considers that it is not for history to deal with prophets in general, we have the attitude of the anti-theological philosophers. This volume extends to A. H. 37 and will be followed by five others. (London: Luzac & Co., 1909.)

D. B. M.

Under the modest title *Studies in Mystical Religion*, Professor Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College has given us a book which, better than any other work in English, gives a history of Christian Mysticism. It is not presented as a full history but as an introduction to a series of historical volumes which will show the development of the Society of Friends. Since the time of Vaughn who wrote "Hours with the Mystics," very little has been done toward writing anything like a systematic historical presentation, so that this volume will be welcomed as a greatly needed addition to our literature on the subject. In the introductory, chapter Dr. Jones gives his definition of Mysticism in these words, "It is the type of religion which puts the emphasis on the immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense, and living stage." He also considers the different types of Mysticism and its relation to Hypnotism, Auto-Suggestion, etc. In the following twenty chapters we have a sympathetic and scholarly presentation of Mysticism. Begin-

ning with the New Testament times the leading men and movements are reviewed down through the period of the English Commonwealth. The review is necessarily a brief one. Anything approaching a comprehensive history would require as many volumes as there are chapters in this book. But Dr. Jones' long years of study on the subject and his rare scholarly ability combined with an unusually pleasing literary style have produced one of the most important works of recent years relating to Church History. No one can go through these chapters without a stronger faith in the vitality of the religion of Christ. They also reveal the fact that in the darkest ages there were men and women leading noble Christian lives. (Macmillan, pp. xxxviii, 518. \$3.50) C. M. G.

Rev. John P. Jones, D.D., of Madura, South India, has for thirty years been a careful and intelligent observer of Indian life and thought. He is already well known to the reading public through several admirable volumes on the religions of India and the progress of Christianity in that country. His latest work on *India, its Life and Thought* is fully up to the standard of his previous writings. In it he attempts the difficult problem of initiating Occidentals into the modern attitude of mind of the great Indian nation. The opening chapter discusses the present unrest in India, and, with remarkable insight and clearness, analyzes the extent, causes, conditions, results, and cure of this unrest. This is followed by a discussion of the numerous religions that flourish side by side in India and in Burmah, which is now a part of the British Indian Empire. Then follows an exhibition of the most salient features of Indian religion, the caste system, the Bhagavad Gita, the Bible of modern Hinduism, popular Hinduism, the religious ideals of Hinduism, and the ethical results of Hinduism. To this is added a sketch of Islam in India, of modern Indian Buddhism, and of recent religious movements within Hinduism. Finally, there is a history of the progress of Christianity in India from the earliest times down to the present. The book is copiously and beautifully illustrated, and is provided with an admirable index. (Macmillan, pp. 443. \$2.50 net.) L. B. P.

President King of Oberlin conceives that all friendships, human and divine, are essentially one; and that within the nature of a friendship, properly conceived and expressed, may be traced the fundamental laws of religion and life. This line of thought, pursued in a course of lectures before an audience of Friends at Haverford College, he now presents in changed form and expanded measure in a book entitled *The Laws of Friendship Human and Divine*. Keeping in his own mind continually and holding continually before the reader the conviction that in exploring this theme he is mapping the entire area of an ideal personal career, that he is employed upon nothing less than the pattern of our eternal well-being, the author has stamped every page with the utmost carefulness, seriousness and sobriety of thought and style. That a page should be engaging does not seem to have entered his mind.

In the part of the book defining what friendship is, what its basis and what its laws, if anywhere, one would look for the closest precision of thought and speech. Its "basis" is declared to be fourfold: worthy

personality, common interests, mutual revelation and trust, mutual self-giving. Throughout the book this fourfoldness is conceived and defined as singly contained in love. And then, as always in that indiscriminate view, love is violently twisted and strained to hold what it never contained. Self-respect and worth and trust are not to be found or placed in any discriminating definition or analysis of love. It would help not a little, if in an earnest handling of friendship, the elemental difference of its different elements could be made as clear in speech as they are in fact. Friendship is essentially a composite thing. Love is one of its components, and is essentially simple. In such a discussion these elements should be defined, not confused. For a sample of the confusion of thought and words sure to result from the absence of such elemental discrimination let anyone fasten his eye with a bit of attention upon the author's effort to define and expound what he calls "the self-forgetful mood" in chapter XVII. But for all that, the book contains, as it inevitably must, a stimulating and elevating exposition of an exalted theme. (Macmillan, pp. x, 159. \$1.25 net.) C. S. B.

The Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, principal of Wycliffe College, Oxford, has in hand the editing of a series of manuals for church people, treating the history, faith, worship and work of the church, and designed to be trustworthy, readable and cheap. A volume in this series, intended to be an incentive and guide to fruitful Bible study for people unskilled and unpracticed in such work, has been prepared by Rev. Harrington C. Lees, entitled *The Joy of Bible Study*. The book is well adapted to be of very general service. For the readers had in mind, every chapter is awakening. It is in no sense systematic. It pursues no course of study. Its aim is simply to be a volume of suggestions and hints, to examine aids and tools, to sample methods, to turn up nuggets, to open vistas. But in its way it is a strong and worthy book, showing a noble author, duly humble, but truly expert. Would there were hosts as handy with the Bible as he. Then might one hope for a more numerous godly few who could see for themselves and show to many more into how majestic an ordered unity all these disconnected fragments and samples may be assembled and arrayed. (Longmans, pp. vi, 127.) C. S. B.

An earnest and powerful appeal, destined to fall, it is to be feared, upon indifferent ears, is expanded into a book from a paper read by Rev. G. U. Wenner before representatives of twenty-nine Protestant churches of America at a meeting of the Inter-Church Conference at Carnegie Hall in 1905. The original paper was entitled "Week-day Religious Instruction." The title of the book here noticed is *Religious Education and the Public School*. It is sub-entitled "An American Problem." Its definite proposition is that public schools so order work Wednesday afternoons that children properly authorized may have liberty of absence without essential loss in order to attend in their respective churches classes for religious instruction. This involves a double appeal and argument: one to the public schools, and one to the churches. The recommendation is grounded upon the all too familiar reasons: the supremacy of religion; its exclusion from the public schools; and the inadequate work in Sunday

schools. The obstacles in the already over-crowded public school curriculum, and in the want of time and training in the leaders of the churches for up-to-date religious instruction are handled with a fine mingling of earnestness and respect. There are brief but effective sketches of history and of current conditions in different countries, shedding light helpfully upon the question. Space is also given for animated critical estimates of the proposition pro and con.

The book is marked, be it said again, with courtesy, ardor and power. It handles our supreme concern. It offers a plan stamped with moderation and good sense. It deserves widespread, solemn heed. But it is sadly liable, be it again confessed, to win little regard. Christian America might learn from pagan Greece. But American Christians do not deem the religious intelligence of their children a supreme concern. (Bonnell, Silver & Co., pp. iv, 163.)

C. S. B.

The author claims that this is the first book, as far as he knows, upon *Biblical Sociology*. He evidently means that it is the first having that name, for he cannot overlook many monographs upon certain social phases of the Old Testament, or the numerous books on "The Social Teachings of the New Testament." He claims, however, that his comprehensive title is owing to an effort on his part to gather "the most important facts and principles of the society of the *whole* Bible, to classify them in a sociological way, and to consider what light they throw upon some of the social problems of today." The results of his study will commend themselves or not to the scientific reader according to the school of evolution to which he belongs, and to the Biblical scholar upon his view of the conclusions of the Higher Criticism. The author accepts "Theistic Evolution," and while he affirms his acceptance of the "methods of scientific historical investigation of the Higher Criticism, and many of its conclusions," he evidently would not satisfy even a conservative Higher Critic that he has modified the older point of view in any essential respect. He holds that a later authorship or compilation or "fiction," as he calls it, violates the experience of all other national histories which are made up from contemporary testimony. He also holds that any theory of social development in a people's literature which throws doubt upon the one thing which is distinctive in that development and literature is unscientific, "for it starts with the conclusion that it cannot be different from other literatures," whereas on its face the Biblical literature as social history "describes a society which groups itself around a supernatural revelation and a conception of God found only in the Bible." He also naively says that "the traditional view of the Bible is the easy way, and the Higher Criticism makes a difficult task. Apart from a rather brief and insufficient chapter on this important matter, he hardly adverts again to any mooted critical issue involved, in the subsequent pages of his book. These difficulties abound on the social side of this question, as they do on the theological, and the book will lack in scholarly acceptability in so far as he fails to discuss the particular difficulties which abound. But on the basis of the traditional view of the Bible, Dr. F. S. Schenck has made a contribution of value, in method at least, even if he has drawn certain conclusions which might be questioned by challenging scholars. His method takes up certain

sociological categories and puts into them *first* the Biblical contributions in Old and New Testament history and teaching, and *secondly*, shows the lessons and applications to modern social conditions. This he does in the main body of his book under the captions of "Hereditv," "The Institution of the Family," "Environment," "Land Laws," "The Institution of Industry," "The Institution of Culture," "The Institution of Control," "Social Pathology," "The Ideal of Social Health." In the author's effort to bring out the modern analogies to the Biblical facts and principles, he has shown wide reading, and displays great suggestiveness; but he almost never gives his authorities for his facts and figures. This is a serious defect of the book, as it robs us of confidence in his sources. But the book is a pioneer of its kind, and so we are indebted to the author for leading the way to a class of literature which will abound more and more in the next decade. (Board of Publication of the Reformed Church, pp. 419. \$1.50 net.)

A. R. M.

Few books upon phases of the social problem have appeared so entirely commendable as this last book of Dr. E. T. Devine, on *Misery and its Causes*. From his position at the head of the New York Charity Organization Society, and from his prominence in three special investigations (made possible by Mrs. Sage's benefactions) upon Social Conditions in Pittsburg, upon the Standard of Living, and upon the Need of an Employment Bureau in New York City, Dr. Devine is able to speak with authority. His book is no mere discussion of relief-giving in the ordinary sense of the word. He is not dealing only with Pauperism, nor with Poverty alone; but with Misery—a much larger term. By misery he means suicide, crime, the social evil, accident, incapacity, ignorance, as well as destitution pure and simple. He is seeking for some causes of the weariness, dreariness, and hopelessness of life as well as of its specific dependency and delinquency. While recognizing certain elements of truth in personal moral responsibility for misery, he cannot dismiss, as many do, evident facts which disprove the easy assumption that all suffering is from ill-desert. It is not poverty only nor is it punishment simply that explains misery, but it is principally certain maladjustments, for which society as a whole is chiefly responsible. While not going to the extreme of some writers in laying everything upon wrong economic conditions, in the strictly material sense of the term, he yet calls these maladjustments "economic" in the strict sense of the term as social house-keeping. Such economic evils it is in the power of society to obviate in time. His wide observation has led him to think that many of the worst hardships of our time are "economic, social, measurable, manageable. Misery is communicable, curable and preventable." He illustrates this main thesis by some general statements about suicide, crime, prostitution, and the institutional cases of poverty. Then follows the bulk of his book, dealing more in detail on those "out of health," "out of work," "out of friends," "adverse conditions in dependent families." Having treated the causes in the principal part of his discussion, he has a final chapter on the "Justice and Prosperity of the Future," in which he outlines certain essential conditions which he thinks it not only just but possible for society to bring about without a radical and needless revolution of our present

system. These conditions are: (1) sound physical heredity; (2) a protected childhood; (3) a prolonged working period in life; (4) freedom from preventable disease; (5) freedom from professional crime; (6) some general system of insurance; (7) education for rational living; (8) a liberal relief system when needed; (9) possibility of a sufficiently high standard of living wage; (10) a religion which recognizes its great social sanctions and duties.

This book is characterized by its ability to portray the deep shadows of our present system of society without pessimism, and without recourse to the radical solution of socialism. It is a book which plucks hope and feasibility out of the most adverse conditions, and calls the age to certain possible ameliorations. The book is written without hysteria. The book has a charming literary quality. The book is full of data, doubtless reliable as coming from a recognized authority, who is both a scientific explorer and a great prophet of optimism. He faces the facts, he yet gives hope, but not without social duty performed. (Macmillan, pp. 274. \$1.25.)

A. R. M.

Among the Alumni

NECROLOGY, 1908-1909.

The record of those who have passed on from the roll of the living Alumni of Hartford Seminary as presented at this time covers the names of six persons.

The first is Robert Dexter Miller of the class of 1852.

He was born in Dummerston, Vt., September 23, 1824, graduated from Amherst College in 1848, was for two years principal of the Academy in Purdy, West Tennessee, before entering the Theological Institute of Connecticut. He was ordained pastor of the church at North Wardsboro, Vt., July 2, 1856, after having supplied other churches for three years. For twenty-five years he occupied various charges in northern Massachusetts and in Vermont, the last being in West Hartford, Vt., from 1880-1885. After the close of this pastorate he withdrew from active ministerial service and resided in the neighborhood of Boston most of the time until his death, January 25, 1909.

John Henry Goodell of the Class of 1874 died April 21 1909. He was born in Millbury, Mass., March 13, 1844. He came to the Seminary without a college course but made his mark as a student and a man. His first pastorate was over the Presbyterian Church in Spencertown, N. Y., and the Congregational Church in Austerlitz, near by. In 1878 he was installed over the church in Windsor Locks, Conn., where he worked for ten years, endearing himself not only to his immediate parish, but to the circle of churches to which it belongs. From 1888 onward he was identified with the Far West, engaging first in missionary enterprises in Utah, then removing to California, where besides serving several churches at different times he was for four years instructor in the Pacific Theological Seminary. His final pastorate, beginning in 1905, was at Pacific Grove. Mr. Goodell was a man of strong personality, vigorous convictions, deep consecration and much popular power. Wherever he worked he left a positive impress that will not soon be forgotten and a memory that will be cherished. His wife and one married daughter survive him.

Israel Newton Terry, of the class of 1875, was the third of the name to pass through Hartford Seminary, his father having graduated in 1838 and his uncle in 1843. He was born at South Weymouth, Mass., in 1851, graduated from Amherst College in 1871. His course in the Seminary was preceded by a year of business in New York, and followed by a year of study in Union Theological Seminary, from which he went to the Presbyterian Church of New Hartford, N. Y., where he was ordained in 1877. His ministry was within the Presbyterian Church, and he occupied various charges in central New York, the last being in Ithaca, where he died July 16, 1908. He is survived by his wife, to whom he was married in 1880.

Gilbert Allen Curtiss, of the class of 1877, died July 17, 1908. He was born in West Stockbridge, Mass., April 25, 1848. His Seminary course was pursued in connection with pastoral work in West Hartland, Conn., and later at Mineville, N. Y. During the nearly twenty years of his pastoral activity he occupied various fields in New England and eastern New York. His last pastorate was in Chester, Mass., from which he was constrained to resign in 1906 on account of ill health. He was a man of firmness of conviction and earnestness in the work of the master. He was married in 1873 to Elbertine S. Fuller of Housatonic, Mass.

Daniel Miner Rogers was born in New Britain April 25, 1882. He graduated from Princeton University in 1903, and from Hartford Seminary in 1906. For two years he ministered successfully to the church in Dorset, Vt., and in the spring of 1908 was married to Marie Phelps Christie who graduated from the Seminary that year. In the fall he went out as missionary of the American Board to Hadjin, Turkey. April 15, 1909, he was shot by the mob at Adana, while striving to protect the lives of the missionaries and the home of a Turkish widow adjacent to the property of the mission. His wife and infant child survive him.

This is not the time for adequate appreciation of the character of one, the pathetic tragedy of whose death has touched the sympathies of the Christian world. Stalwart of body, strong of intellect, big of heart, absolute in consecration — combining in an extraordinary degree the scholar's love of knowledge, the mystic's intimacy with his God, and the practical common sense and industry of a Connecticut-bred boy, he seemed destined to accomplish great things through the power of a long and influential life. By God's impenetrable providence he has been

chosen to the ranks of those whose achievements and witnessing for Christ is through death. We of this fellowship mourn him and beseech the divine comfort upon the four generations of dear ones whose love and need centered in him.

Robert C. Dougherty, of the class of 1907, died by his own hand Sunday morning, December 27, 1908, in his first pastorate at Buchanan, North Dakota, where he had greatly endeared himself to the people of that parish, as well as of Prairie, where he also ministered. He was born at Ottawa, Kans., January 11, 1880. He graduated from Washburn College in 1902. His course here was supplemented, after some time spent in effort to secure firmer health, by work in Chicago Seminary, where he received the degree of B.D. in 1908. As a student he was thorough, earnest and laborious. He won the respect and affection of students and faculty by the excellence of his personal quality, and the profound sincerity of his life and purpose. While at Hartford his health was not robust, and there were manifest tendencies to a morbid self-depreciation. For about a month before his death his life had been shadowed by a gloom which neither the kindly helpfulness of friends nor recourse to his physician were able to dissipate.

His parents, brother and sisters at the family home in Kansas City, Kans., have the heartfelt sympathy of the Hartford Alumni.

The enforced omission of all alumni news from the July issue of THE RECORD makes it necessary in this issue to cover a long period of time in our summary and to condense many items into less space than would otherwise be gladly given.

HENRY C. ALVORD, '79, spent two months abroad during the summer, mostly in England and Scotland.

In the series of Bulletins issued by Marietta College there appeared last spring a notable paper by President ALFRED T. PERRY, '85, on "The Small College," in which the function of such institutions in general education is set forth with special clearness and force. Marietta, under President Perry's leadership, seems to be fulfilling this function with conspicuous success.

ROBERT H. BALL, '89, has recently celebrated the completion of his twentieth year as pastor at Fair Haven, Vermont, as well as the twentieth of his marriage. The occasion was made memorable by many tokens of honor and esteem from his people.

HERBERT K. JOB, '91, having withdrawn from his pastorate at Kent, Connecticut, is entering upon extensive work as a writer and lecturer on

various subjects connected with his specialty of bird-lore, in which he has an international reputation. His permanent address is 291 Main Street, West Haven, Connecticut.

Among the many letters received from alumni at the recent Anniversary was one from Iso ABE, '94, referring at some length to his work since leaving the Seminary. For ten years, since giving up a short pastorate and spending two years in teaching at the Doshisha, he has been on the faculty of Waseda University, Tokio, his subjects being in the fields of social and municipal science. He continues to serve often as preacher in various churches. He has been a prolific and successful author, his recent book on "The Ideal Man," for example, being already in its eighth edition. Incidentally he has interested himself much in student athletics, and has arranged international competitions between his university and more than one institution in California and elsewhere. His family includes six children.

We have received a pamphlet describing the work of the School of Domestic Science of the Boston Y. W. C. A., of which A. JOSEPHINE FOREHAND, '95, has been director for over ten years. It gives a striking impression of the varied and extensive courses of training offered, and, in the list of positions filled by alumnae, suggests how the influence of the school has spread throughout the country to all sorts of institutions and organizations.

In June CHARLES A. BRAND, '98, for seven years in charge of important editorial work for the Sunday School and Publishing Society at Boston, was obliged to resign for reasons of health. He has removed to the Far West, where he is engaged for the present in business. Happily, he has not ceased to use his pen, and a recent issue of the *Congregationalist* was enriched by a racy article on conditions in Idaho.

The First Church in Lynn, Massachusetts, where GEORGE W. OWEN, '03, has been pastor since his graduation, not long ago set up a tablet commemorating the long period of 175 years from 1632 during which the church and the town were united more or less organically, the church edifice, known as "The Tunnel," being virtually the Town Hall. The exercises of dedication were participated in by representatives of the present city government and the local Historical Society. They also marked the 277th anniversary of the church itself.

WILLIAM M. PROCTOR, '04, who has been pastor at Ritzville, Washington, since 1906, after brief service as superintendent of the Church Extension Society for the state, with headquarters at Spokane, has accepted a call to remove to Nome, Alaska.

C. ARTHUR LINCOLN, '05, who began work as pastor of the First Church in Moline, Illinois, in April, was installed on June 7th, President Ozora S. Davis, '94, of Chicago, preaching the sermon. Nearly fifty members have been added to the church during the summer, and there are many signs of increasing interest.

The church at Ludlow, Massachusetts, where HENRY F. BURDON, '07, has been pastor for a year, is prospering in many ways. The roll of members has been increased by fifty-one. About a hundred have been added to the Sunday-school, taxing its accommodations to the utmost. An evening service has been successfully inaugurated. The pastor's salary has been raised to \$1200, and he has now been engaged indefinitely.

AUGUST RUECKER, '07, besides his work as a German Evangelical pastor in Cincinnati, Ohio, is taking philosophical and psychological studies in the University of Cincinnati with a view of winning the master's degree.

Among our missionary alumni, we note that in August, LYNDON S. CRAWFORD, '79, returned to his post at Trebizond, Asia Minor; that GEORGE E. WHITE, '87, and GEORGE P. KNAPP, '90 the former of Marsovan, the latter of Harpoot, are in this country on furlough; that JOHN E. MERRILL, '97, President of the college at Aintab, was ordained to the ministry on October 10th, at Minneapolis, Minnesota, with notable exercises; that HOWARD S. GALT, '99, sailed on August 1st from San Francisco for his station at Tungcho, China; and that HAROLD I. GARDNER, '07, was ordained to the missionary service at the Farmington Avenue Church, Hartford, on September 19th, being under appointment to fill the place made vacant by the tragic death of D. MINER ROGERS, '06, in Asia Minor.

Changes of location in the pastorate have occurred as follows:

RUFUS S. UNDERWOOD, '68, from Springfield, Mass., to Redding, Conn.; JOHN MARSLAND, '76, from Brooklyn, N. Y., to East Rockaway; CHARLES F. WEEDEN, '87, from Lynn, Mass., to the Harvard Church, Dorchester; OWEN JENKINS, graduate student in 1886-07, from Greenwich, O., to Newcastle and Silt, Colo.; JULES A. DEROME, '88, from Towner, N. D., to Centerville, S. D.; FREDERICK M. HOLLISTER, '91, from Cromwell, Conn., to North Stonington; IRVING A. BURNAP, '92, from Broad Brook, Conn., to the Pilgrim Church, Hartford; EDWARD A. LATHROP, '95, from Tryon, N. C., to the Piedmont College Church, Demorest, Ga.; EDWIN S. BISHOP, '97, from Oak Park, Ill. to the First Church, Grand Rapids, Mich.; GEORGE E. KINNEY, '97, from East Lee, N. H., to the Sixth St. Church, Auburn, Me.; VERNON H. DEMING, '98, from North Wilbraham, Mass., to Douglas and East Douglas; HARRY A. S. ABBE, '00, recently of Stowe, Vt., to Somers, Conn.; FREDERICK B. LYMAN, '00, from Fairhaven, Mass., to Shrewsbury; AUGUSTINE P. MANWELL, '00, from Canton, Mass., to the Geddes Church, Syracuse, N. Y.; MALCOLM DANA, '01, from Maquoketa, Iowa, to Hallowell, Me.; MONTIE J. B. FULLER, '02, from Plainfield, Mass., to Erving; GEORGE B. HAWKES, '02, from McCook, Neb., to Sutton; HERBERT L. PACKARD, '02, from Strong, Me., to Andover; and MILO R. WEIDMAN, '05, from Wisner, Neb., to Hudson, S. D.; TELESPHORE TAISNE, '02, was installed at Durham, N. H., on May 17th; and ROGER A. DUNLAP, '03, at Windsor Locks, Conn., on March 17th, the sermon being by Professor Merriam.

I. CURTIS MESERVE, '69, has recently resigned his charge in San Francisco, Cal.; DAVID P. HATCH, '86, has resigned at Franklin, N. H.; HARRY C. ADAMS, '89, has resigned at Danvers, Mass.; ALVIN C. BACON, '08, has resigned at New Britain, Conn., to take up fellowship study abroad.

Of the recent class of 1909, JOHN J. BRAUN is called to the German Evangelical Church in Buffalo, N. Y.; RAY E. BUTTERFIELD to Medway Village, Mass.; LAWRENCE F. McDONALD to Cass Lake, Minn.; BELLE C. MORRILL to the Baptist Training School in Chicago; EUGENE B. SMITH to Lebanon, Conn.; FREDERICK F. VOORHEES to the Methodist Church at East Hampton, N. Y.; NEWTON E. ROBERTS to Paris, Tex.; JAMES M. YARD to Nichols, Conn.; while HOWARD A. WALTER goes abroad for study on a fellowship, and CARL F. CRUSIUS and WILLIAM C. WOOD return to Hartford for post-graduate study on the Jacobus Fellowship.

Happenings in the Seminary

THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY.

The report of the Anniversary presented in the last RECORD confined itself of necessity to a presentation of the formal exercises of the occasion. It was impossible therefore to even attempt to reproduce any of the impressions that the occasions made on the institutional life or on the minds and hearts of those present. It is impossible to make these vivid at a remove of months. Yet the echoes of the enthusiasm aroused by the occasion have by no means died away and they will remain permanently with those who were privileged to be present. The splendid assemblage of the Alumni, the wide interest of the people of Hartford, the admirable arrangement and execution of the details of the administration of the occasion, as well as the extraordinarily high character of the formal exercises, all conspired to give to the occasion a quality of high distinction.

While the presence of so many speakers and visitors from beyond what is usually esteemed the natural constituency of the Seminary gave to the occasion a breadth of sweep that is not, of course, customary at the Commencement season of the Seminary, still the peculiar intimacy of the home relations of those returning to their theological mother well-beloved was not submerged, but the rather intensified and carried to an even higher level than is usual.

It will be the purpose of what follows briefly to outline the succession of those events of the Anniversary which are the more closely associated with the home affairs and customary administration of the Seminary, as supplemental to the more formal concerns with which the institution manifested its consciousness of the significance of its seventy-five years' growth, recognized the large responsibility which these years have laid upon it and expressed its high purpose of serviceableness to the Church of Christ in the future.

NORFOLK VISIT.

It was a most gracious courtesy that led Hon. H. H. Bridgman of Norfolk, President of the Board of Trustees, to invite to his

home the Trustees, the Faculty and invited guests from abroad. A special car was provided for the party and at Norfolk they were welcomed by Mr. and Mrs. Bridgman to their spacious home, with its marvelously beautiful outlook over the Norfolk downs and the outrolling Berkshire hills, and sat down, twenty-three in number, to a round table, exquisitely decorated, and bountifully spread. After the luncheon there were made brief addresses of felicitation and then the party visited the church and other interesting spots in the town which consecrated wealth has done so much to beautify and bless, returning in the special car upon the afternoon train.

THE OPENING SUNDAY.

First a word as to the exercises of the Sunday which began the week. It was an event of large significance to have Hartford men occupying some twenty-five pulpits in Hartford and vicinity — not to speak about their own institution, but to present in a broad way to varied congregations of many denominations of Christians, the significance for the life of the Church of the Christian ministry and its claims to the service of young men. Neither statistics, the mention of the names of preachers, nor even a description of their discourses, would present any adequate picture of the significance of such an occurrence.

ALUMNI DAY.

Although the great interest of the day was centered in what had been wrought by the out-putting life of the Seminary as it had developed in the successive localities where Providence had placed it, and in the world-wide achievements of its Alumni in many fields of Christian service, the meeting when the business of the Alumni was transacted was of unusual interest.

Two matters of especial interest were brought forward. The first, the report of the committee appointed the preceding year to prosecute the effort to raise among the alumni \$1,500 for the purpose of providing fellowships for two years on which men could be sent abroad to learn the language, life, social and religious customs and atmosphere of some of the races at the present time migrating to this country to make their homes, and whose presence here makes both the crisis and the opportunity of Home Missions. The committee reported that through an obvious misunderstanding of precisely what was the purpose and scope of the letter sent out to the Alumni the response had not yet been as large as was hoped. A paper was accordingly circulated which, during the day, resulted in the pledging of one-half of the

needed amount and the committee was instructed to continue its labors in the prosecution of this end.

The other event was the raising of a committee of the Alumni, one serving as a member of the Board of Trustees, another as a member of the Faculty, and a third an executive officer of the Alumni Association, to take up and prosecute the work of preparing an Historical Catalogue of the Alumni, down to the date of publication. The committee appointed consisted of Rev. L. W. Hicks of Wellesley, Mass., Prof. A. L. Gillett, and Rev. T. C. Richards of Warren, Mass.

The formal business of the meeting was as follows: Rev. C. S. Lane of Mt. Vernon presided. On recommendation of the Nominating Committee, consisting of G. A. Hall, W. C. Rhoades, J. M. Trout, the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, William E. Strong; vice-president, Herbert A. Barker; secretary and treasurer for three years, Thomas C. Richards; Executive Committee, the officers with E. C. Gillette, W. F. Stearns, H. C. Ide; Necrologist, A. L. Gillett.

PASTORAL UNION.

Rev. W. F. English presided at the annual meeting of the Pastoral Union, held Wednesday morning. One of the older alumni, Rev. William Hallock, of the Class of 1859, was present for the first time in several years, and his brief address was a pleasant feature of the meeting.

The following were chosen to membership in the Union: Rev. E. E. S. Johnson, Rev. J. W. Ballantine, Rev. J. F. Johnstone.

To fill vacancies on the Board of Trustees for the term ending 1911, caused by the resignation of Rev. F. A. Noble, D.D., and Rev. O. S. Davis, D.D., Rev. H. W. Maier of New Britain and Waterman R. Burnham, Esq., of Norwich, were elected.

The following were re-elected for the term of three years, ending in 1912: Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. W. Douglas Mackenzie, D.D., Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Lewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn.; Rev. Charles M. Southgate, Boston, Mass.; Rev. William E. Strong, Newtonville, Mass.; Mr. Atwood Collins, Hartford, Conn.; Colonel Charles M. Jarvis, Berlin, Conn.; Major William Ives Washburn, New York City; Hon. David W. Williams, Glastonbury, Conn.

For the ensuing year, officers were chosen as follows: Moderator, Rev. O. W. Means; Member of Executive Committee until 1912, Rev. Wm. C. Prentiss; Members of Examining Committee for three years, Rev. George B. Hatch, Rev. L. H. Hallock.

GRADUATION EXERCISES.

At the Graduation Exercises the following degrees and certificates were conferred:

The Degree of Master of Sacred Theology upon Raymond Augustus Beardslee, B.D., Hartford, Conn., Yale University, 1905, Hartford Theological Seminary, 1908; Albert Scott Hawkes, B.D., Wilson, Conn., Oberlin College, 1893, Hartford Theological Seminary, 1900; Zenjiro Yatsu, B.D., Sendai, Japan, North Japan College, 1899, North Japan Seminary, 1902, Princeton Seminary, 1908.

The Degree of Bachelor of Divinity upon John Jacob Braun, Lamar, Ind., Elmhurst College, 1904, Eden Seminary; Carl Frederick Crusius, Perkinsville, N. Y., Elmhurst College, 1905, Eden Seminary; Lawrence Free MacDonald, Parkton, Md., Wesleyan University, 1906; Belle Chapman Morrill, South Hadley, Mass., Mount Holyoke College, 1905; Eugene Bernard Smith, South Framingham, Mass., Bates College, 1904; Frederick Franklin Voorhees, Wilson, Conn., Wesleyan University, 1906; Howard Arnold Walter, New Britain, Conn., Princeton University, 1905; William Carleton Wood, Oskaloosa, Ia., Penn College, 1905; James Maxon Yard, Rocky Hill, Conn., Wesleyan University, 1905.

The Certificate of Graduation upon Ray Evans Butterfield, Hartford, Conn., Dartmouth College, 1906; Newton Everts Roberts, Lincoln University, Penn., Brunswick (Br. Guiana) Normal College, 1899, Theol. Dept. Lincoln University; Thomas Eynon Williams, Marietta, O., Marietta College, 1906.

Honors were awarded as follows: The William Thompson Fellowship to Howard Arnold Walter, Class of 1909; a Special Fellowship in Church History to Elmer Ellsworth Schultz Johnson, Class of 1902; the Porter Ogden Jacobus Prize Fellowship to Raymond Augustus Beardslee, Class of 1908; the Hartranft Prize to Howard Arnold Walter, of the Senior Class; the Turretin Prize to James Maxon Yard of the Senior Class; the Greek Prize to Howard Arnold Walter of the Senior Class; the Bennet Tyler Prize to William Francis Rowlands of the Middle Class; the William Thompson Prize to William Thomson of the Junior Class.

A happy incident associated with the Anniversary but coming some weeks later was the conferring by Trinity College upon Professor Macdonald of the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

It was peculiarly fitting that the last service of this Seventy-fifth Anniversary should be held in the Center Church. The

occasion was at once symbolic of the outreach of the Seminary into the life of the community and of the cordial hospitality which the city through its oldest church extended to the Seminary. The association of the Seminary with the First Church of Christ in Hartford had been, ever since its removal from East Windsor Hill, singularly close and friendly, with results of great importance to it and, it is to be hoped, not without value to the church.

The Seminary opened for its seventy-sixth year with an impulse from its Seventy-fifth Anniversary celebration and every prospect of a harmonious and successful session. The opening exercises were held on the evening of September 22d. In the absence of the President, Dean Jacobus presided and Professor Merriam conducted the devotional service. The formal address was by Professor Duncan B. Macdonald, who chose his subject from the field of his special studies in Mohammedan theology and life. He spoke upon "One Phase of the Doctrine of the Unity of God, and Some Consequences."

After the students had fully assembled a few days later, it was found that the Seminary had lost but two or three men from the lower classes of last year, and that the accessions more than compensated for the changes by graduation and removal. The total enrollment for the year is 69, of whom 4 are Fellows, 6 Post-graduates in residence, 20 Seniors, 16 Middlers, 17 Juniors and 6 Specials. Messrs. Crusius and Wood of the last graduating class have been appointed to the two Porter Ogden Jacobus Fellowships, and are pursuing their graduate studies in the Seminary. R. A. Beardslee, who won the Fellowship of the same name last year, also remains for further graduate study. The Junior class is composed more largely than for some years of graduates of the Eastern colleges. Amherst, Dartmouth, Harvard, Bates, Yale, Princeton and Syracuse University are represented. The men of this class are more mature than sometimes. Two or three of them have had teaching experience; one has been in business; one has been engaged in Y. M. C. A. work in China; and one in the same kind of work at home; two have been in the pastorate. There is every indication of congenial companionship in the class itself and a large contribution by it to the harmonious life of the Seminary.

President Mackenzie is lengthening his vacation, after a particularly exacting and exhausting year. He is in England and will remain there until the complete restoration of his health. Meanwhile he will come into touch with his fellow-members of the important Commission on the preparation of Missionaries, in anticipation of the great Missionary Conference in Edinburgh next June. But he will devote himself chiefly to recuperation. Plans are being made for carrying on his work during his absence.

On the evening of October 1st the Faculty gave an informal reception to the students. Members of the Board of Trustees were present and the

Faculty families, and the evening spent together was a pleasant occasion for the forming of acquaintance and of reunion.

About fifteen of the men had regular preaching appointments for the vacation or part of it, in widely scattered locations. Others were variously employed. At the first hour for general exercises accounts of summer experiences were given by four men. Mr. Akana had preached in a Massachusetts hill town. Mr. English cared for a Vermont parish. Mr. Kelts built a church in North Dakota. Mr. Christie saw real life as keeper of a general store and post-office at a shore resort.

Outside speakers in the opening weeks of the term have been Rev. R. H. Potter, D.D., and Rev. E. A. Dent, D.D., of Hartford, and Mr. Robert Bachman of New York, representing the Bureau of Municipal Research on "The Minister and the Budget"; a new phase of municipal administration, which it is well worth the minister's while to be posted about.

A live topic was chosen for the Carew Lectures this year, and the treatment of it is in the right hands. President Kenyon L. Butterfield of the Massachusetts Agricultural College, who has also served on the United States Commission on Country Life, is giving five lectures on the general theme "The Church and the Rural Problem." Some pains have been taken to circulate invitations to these lectures more widely than common, chiefly among the ministers of country churches of all denominations in Connecticut and southern Massachusetts, in the hope that, even if not able to be present, they would find some encouragement in the fact that their problems are receiving sympathetic investigation.

An event of great interest to the Seminary life was the Ministerial Retreat, where, upon invitation of the Seminary and a committee representing all denominations, ministers from Connecticut and from adjoining states came together for a season of quiet conference and spiritual communion. The general theme was the work of the Holy Spirit presented in various phases. Dr. Robert F. Horton of London had accepted an invitation to come to America to be the leader. Others participating were Professor H. S. Nash, D.D., of the Cambridge Divinity School; Professor Cornelius Woelfkin, D.D., of Rochester Theological Seminary, and Rev. J. D. Adam, D.D., of the First Presbyterian Church of East Orange. The Retreat was largely attended, and brought spiritual uplift to all who were present.



